SEC. 3. The Commissioner shall establish a training school for the proper instruction of persons volunteering for service in the Police Force. Such school shall be situated at such place or places as the Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary of War, may determine. Student recruits at such school shall receive compensation at the rate of $75 per month, and shall be furnished quarters and rations in kind. Training at such school shall not be required of any person whom the Commissioner finds qualified for service in the Police Force.

SEC. 4. No person shall be accepted for service in the Police Force or for training for such service unless he is a citizen of the United States and his physical and mental fitness for such service has been satisfactorily determined.

SEC. 5. The Secretary of War shall issue from time to time to the Police Force, upon requisition of the Commissioner, such arms, ammunition, engineer and sanitary matériel, aircraft, motor vehicles, and military supplies of all kinds as may be necessary to enable the Police Force to carry out its duties and functions under this act.

SEC. 6. The Commissioner shall provide the members of the Police Force with suitable uniforms and other clothing, and, with the approval of the Secretary of War, shall prescribe such rules and regulations as may be deemed necessary for the control and regulation of the Police Force.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, at the close of the legislative business on next Tuesday, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOOD). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Friday, November 23, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Transportation Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Monday, November 26, 1945. Business to be considered: To begin hearings on H. R. 2764, freight forwarders' legislation.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds at 10 o'clock a. m. on Wednesday, November 28, 1945, to consider H. R. 4719.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will continue its consideration of H. R. 2346 and other related bills regarding benefits to merchant seamen on Thursday, November 29, 1945, at 10 a. m., in open hearings.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MASON: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 4605. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940, to preserve the nationality of naturalized veterans, their wives, minor children, and dependent parents; without amendment (Rept. No. 1275). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 4628. A bill to amend section 332 (a) of the Nationality Act of 1940; without amendment (Rept. No. 1276). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MORRISON: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2644. A bill for the relief of Eli Richmond; with amendment (Rept. No. 1274). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MASON: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 233. A bill for the relief of Hamsah Omar; without amendment (Rept. No. 1277). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 2809. A bill for the relief of Theodore Maudrame; without amendment (Rept. No. 1278). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 2887. A bill for the relief of Joseph Mrak; with amendment (Rept. No. 1279). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HEDRICK: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 3765. A bill for the relief of Herman Trahn; with amendment (Rept. No. 1280). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan:

H. R. 4766. A bill providing for the release of a portion of Marquette National Forest for private use and development; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CURLEY:

H. R. 4767. A bill to correct an inequity existing in the case of holders of adjusted-service certificates who did not accept payment in bonds under the Adjusted Compensation Payment Act, 1936; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLANNAGAN:

H. R. 4768. A bill to better adapt the loan programs authorized by the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, to the needs of veterans and low-income farmers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 4769. A bill to amend section 5 of the act entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to collect and publish statistics of the grade and staple length of cotton"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts:

H. R. 4770. A bill creating an import quota on watches and watch movements; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 4771. A bill to provide for the payment of direct Federal assistance to permanently and totally disabled individuals, blind individuals, and certain individuals 65 years of age or over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4772. A bill to require the payment of prevailing wages on highway construction financed in whole or in part by Federal funds; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

H. R. 4773. A bill to require the registration of legislative counsel and lobbyists; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOOD:

H. R. 4774. A bill to provide for military training of youths in peacetime; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 4775. A bill to regulate subversive and un-American propaganda; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H. Res. 402. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation of the use of air and water shipping facilities in returning surplus troops to the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. Res. 403. Resolution to provide for an investigation of plans for railroad reorganization; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BONNER:

H. R. 4776. A bill for the relief of Mr. H. G. Winfield; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

H. R. 4777. A bill for the relief of the Sawtooth Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FLANNAGAN:

H. R. 4778. A bill to provide for an appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States from a decision of the Court of Claims in a suit instituted by the legal representatives of the estate of Robert D. Wright; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1338. By Mr. CASE of South Dakota: Petition of Mrs. Anna Priebe and others of Lemmon, S. Dak., for legislation that will ban the advertising over the radio of alcoholic beverages, in which beer and wine are today the chief offenders; also recommending a censorship of the motion-picture industry, to eliminate the promotion of drinking and the depiction of a low standard of morals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1339. By Mr. GWINN of New York: Petition of Mrs. John A. Querker and 2,364 other signatories, petitioning the Congress of the United States to open the mail service between Germany and the United States in order that they might help send relief to their loved ones and their families; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

SENATE

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 23, 1945

(Legislative day of Monday, October 29, 1945)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, from all the draining duties in the valley of toil, we would take now the climbing morning path to this shrine of our spirits, here to be made aware of eternal realities and lifted out

of our littleness by abiding values greater than ourselves, to which we would give ourselves with new singleness of purpose.

In this dismaying era with all its darkness, we are deeply thankful for the things that cannot be shaken and for guiding lights that no winds of violence can ever blow out—for the leaping flame of truth and goodness and beauty and integrity and love, the perpetual light fed by the encompassing presence of the Eternal God of our salvation.

Cleanse our hearts that Thou mayest work in us and through us for the coming of Thy kingdom. In the vast difficulties confronting the makers of peace restore and strengthen and sustain our souls and lead us in the paths of righteousness, for Thy name's sake. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The Chief Clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., November 23, 1945.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. CARL HAYDEN, a Senator from the State of Arizona, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
President pro tempore.

Mr. HAYDEN thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, November 20, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on November 21, 1945, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 784. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. John T. Webb, Sr.; and

S. 1036. An act to provide for the adjustment of the compensation of certain members or former members of the armed forces of the United States who, before the expiration of their terminal leave, have performed, or shall hereafter perform, civilian services for the United States, its Territories or possessions, or the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 4489) to extend certain privileges, exemptions, and immunities to international organizations and to the officers and employees thereof, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

THE DECORATIONS CONFERRED BY GREAT BRITAIN ON AMERICAN CHIEFS OF STAFF

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, His Britannic Majesty King George VI, through his Ambassador to the United States, the Earl of Halifax, further confirmed the friendship uniting British and American peoples, and honored the American Chiefs of Staff in a ceremony at the British Embassy, November 21, 1945.

The Chief of Staff to the Commander in Chief William D. Leahy, the Chief of Staff of the Armed Forces and General of the Army George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff and Fleet Admiral Ernest J. King, Chief of Staff and General of the Army Henry H. Arnold, each was decorated with the insignia of Honorary Knight, Grand Cross of the Military Division of the Most Honorable Order of the Bath, G. C. B.

To all who value the history of successful united service in war as progress toward unity for peace, the record of this first combination of the British-American Chiefs of Staff is an encouragement.

That this gracious compliment by our British comrades in arms may be publicly acknowledged, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD, following these remarks:

First. Conferment of G. C. B.'s on United States Chiefs of Staff by the Earl of Halifax.

Second. An account clipped from the New York Times giving further information regarding this ancient Order of the Bath.

There being no objection, the conferment and newspaper article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONFERMENT OF G. C. B.'S ON UNITED STATES CHIEFS OF STAFF, NOVEMBER 21, 1945

No more honorable duty could fall to me than that which I today have to discharge, of conferring upon the leaders of the United States services the decorations which His Majesty the King has been pleased to award.

And by curious coincidence we do this on the day that public announcement is foreshadowed and made of changes in the tenure of these high and responsible posts.

I know how greatly the King would have wished to be able himself to confer these decorations—but that has not been possible.

And there is perhaps the compensating advantage that the conferment in Washington permits the presence of relatives and friends, and of many who have worked most closely with the recipients.

I only wish as we recollect his own special contribution to a great war partnership, that we might have had the presence of Sir John Dill and Lady Dill.

It would be presumptuous, as it would plainly be unnecessary, for me to attempt any appraisement of the quality or value of service which these distinguished officers have rendered. How they directed the creation of power for this country and for the Allies—and how they employed the power thus created.

Such appraisement is part of history and will remain for all men to read.

Certainly the Combined Chiefs of Staff, in which those whom we wish to honor today played so notable a part, has been one of the great achievements of the war. There has never been anything like it between allies before; and the confidence that it was able to establish, has been both a great weapon of victory and a great example for the future. I know what it has meant to the British Chiefs of Staff and to those who represent them in Washington, to work with partners and colleagues on terms of complete mutual trust; and I hope that this practical collaboration may prove a model that will be followed over the years to come in many other fields.

[From the New York Times of November 21, 1945]

BRITAIN DECORATES FOUR MILITARY CHIEFS—HALIFAX PRESENTS ORDER OF THE BATH TO MARSHALL, KING, LEAHY, AND ARNOLD

(By Lewis Wood)

WASHINGTON, November 21.—On behalf of King George VI, the cherished Order of the Bath was bestowed today by the Earl of Halifax, the British Ambassador, on four commanders of America's fighting forces today.

In a ceremony at the British Embassy the Ambassador presented the insignia of Honorary Knight Grand Cross of the Military Division of the Most Honorable Order of the Bath (G. C. B.) to Fleet Admiral William D. Leahy, General of the Army George C. Marshall, Fleet Admiral Ernest J. King, and General of the Army Henry H. Arnold.

The British Ambassador said that it would be presumptuous for him to appraise their services in the war.

"Such appraisement," he said, "will be part of history and will remain for all men to read. Never before has there been anything like this in the history of allies. This cooperation has been a great weapon of victory and a great example for the future."

Happily enough, the Ambassador stated, the occasion came on the very day when it was announced that the tenure of Generals Marshall and Arnold, and Admiral King would be changed.

The American officers were escorted by the British Chiefs of Staff in Washington, Field Marshal Sir Henry Maitland Wilson, Admiral of the Fleet Sir James Somerville, Lt. Gen. Sir Gordon N. Macready, and Air Marshal Douglas Colyer. The eight men slowly paced up a center aisle and then the British officers ranged themselves on either side before the Ambassador, who stood between American and British flags on standards.

First to receive the honor was General Marshall. As he stood there, an aide of the Embassy advanced with a red velvet pillow upon which rested the decoration, a star, which was then pinned by the Ambassador on the general's uniform. A British airman then laid over the General's shoulder a broad red ribbon from which hung another decoration. The officer was Squadron Leader John Mitchell, assistant air attaché, and the navigator of former Prime Minister Churchill's plane.

One by one the Americans received the Order of the Bath, founded in 1399, and received by King George I in 1725. Ambassador Halifax congratulated each. The whole affair was over in 15 minutes, whereupon the Ambassador invited his guests to tea, but warned the American commanders that they must first afford the photographers full opportunity.

Formalities ended, relatives and friends crowded forward for congratulations.

The Order of the Bath is divided into a military division and a civil division. There are three classes in each, viz, Knight Grand Cross (G. C. B.); Knight Commander (K. C. B.), and Companion (C. B.).

The C. B. of the Military Division is conferred only on officers of or above the rank of commander in the Navy, or major in the Army, who have been mentioned in dispatches for services in war, and they may subsequently be advanced to the higher grades of the order. The civil C. B. may be bestowed upon officers of the fighting services in times of peace, and upon civilians.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE DURING THE RECESS

Under authority of the order of the Senate of the 20th instant, the following reports of the Committee on Claims were submitted on November 21, 1945:

By Mr. ELLENDER:

H. R. 843. A bill for the relief of Francis A. Hanley; without amendment (Rept. No. 756);

H. R. 850. A bill for the relief of Sybil Georgette Townsend; without amendment (Rept. No. 757);

H. R. 1192. A bill granting travel pay and other allowances to certain soldiers of the War with Spain and the Philippine Insurrection who were discharged in the Philippine Islands; without amendment (Rept. No. 758);

H. R. 1316. A bill for the relief of the estate of Mattie Lee Brown, deceased; without amendment (Rept. No. 759);

H. R. 1358. A bill for the relief of O. M. Minatree; without amendment (Rept. No. 760);

H. R. 1960. A bill for the relief of the estate of Alfred Lewis Cosson, deceased, and others; without amendment (Rept. No. 761);

H. R. 1978. A bill for the relief of Jay H. McCleary; without amendment (Rept. No. 762);

H. R. 2029. A bill for the relief of Wesley J. Stewart; without amendment (Rept. No. 763);

H. R. 2191. A bill for the relief of Cleo E. Baker; without amendment (Rept. No. 764);

H. R. 2300. A bill for the relief of the estate of John R. Blackmore and Louise D. Blackmore; without amendment (Rept. No. 765);

H. R. 2886. A bill for the relief of the estate of Harper Theodore Duke, Jr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 766);

H. R. 3135. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Addie S. Lewis; without amendment (Rept. No. 767);

H.R. 3225. A bill for the relief of Rolla Duncan; without amendment (Rept. No. 768); and

H. R. 3390. A bill for the relief of the estate of Thomas McGarroll; with an amendment (Rept. No. 769).

By Mr. O'DANIEL:

S. 1371. A bill for the relief of Reginald Mitchell; without amendment (Rept. No. 773);

H. R. 2518. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of Eastern Contracting Co., a corporation, against the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 774); and

H. R. 2595. A bill for the relief of Patrick A. Kelly; without amendment (Rept. No. 775).

By Mr. MORSE:

H. R. 874. A bill for the relief of L. Wilmoth Hodges; with an amendment (Rept. No. 772);

H. R. 977. A bill for the relief of John August Johnson; without amendment (Rept. No. 770); and

H. R. 2427. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ruth Cox; without amendment (Rept. No. 771).

By Mr. HUFFMAN:

H. R. 1142. A bill for the relief of Carl Lewis; without amendment (Rept. No. 776);

H. R. 2189. A bill for the relief of Clifford E. Craig; without amendment (Rept. No. 777); and

H. R. 2290. A bill for the relief of Mary Galipeau; without amendment (Rept. No. 778).

By Mr. WHERRY:

H. R. 2836. A bill for the relief of Angelo Gianquitti and George Gianquitti; without amendment (Rept. No. 779);

H. R. 2930. A bill for the relief of Dr. J. D. Whiteside and St. Luke's Hospital; with amendments (Rept. No. 781); and

H. R. 3011. A bill for the relief of John Hames; without amendment (Rept. No. 780).

SENATOR FROM KENTUCKY

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the credentials of the newly designated Senator from Kentucky, who has been appointed by the Governor to fill the vacancy created by the resignation of former Senator Chandler, are at the desk. I ask that they be read, and that the new Senator be permitted to take the oath of office at this time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the credentials.

The credentials were read and ordered to be placed on file, as follows:

CERTIFICATE OF APPOINTMENT

FRANKFORT, KY., *November 19, 1945.*

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

This is to certify that pursuant to the power vested in me by the Constitution of the United States and the laws of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, I, Simeon Willis, Governor of said Commonwealth, do hereby appoint Hon. WILLIAM A. STANFILL a Senator from said Commonwealth to represent the State of Kentucky in the Senate of the United States until the vacancy therein caused by the resignation of Hon. A. B. Chandler is filled by election, as provided by law.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor Simeon Willis, and our seal hereto affixed at Frankfort, Ky., this 19th day of November, in the year of our Lord 1945.

Given under my hand and seal as Governor of the Commonwealth of Kentucky at 2 p. m. this, the 19th day of November, in the year of our Lord 1945, and in the one hundred and fifty-fourth year of the Commonwealth.

[SEAL] SIMEON WILLIS,

Governor, Commonwealth of Kentucky.

Attest:

CHARLES K. O'CONNELL,

Secretary of State.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If the Senator designate will present himself at the desk the oath of office will be administered to him.

Mr. STANFILL, escorted by Mr. BARKLEY, advanced to the desk of the President pro tempore, and the oath of office prescribed by law was administered to him by the Acting President pro tempore.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

Resolutions adopted by the Permanent Status Delegation of the Legislature of Puerto Rico and the board of directors of the Civic-Charitable Association of Ensenada, P. R., expressing gratitude to President Truman for his message to Congress recognizing the right of the people of Puerto Rico with regard to self-determination; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A telegram in the nature of a petition from Benjamin Fuller Post, No. 64, American Legion, of Pittsburg, Kans., favoring enactment of peacetime compulsory military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WALSH:

Resolutions adopted by Local No. 21, of Peabody, Local No. 22, of Woburn, Local No. 46, of Worcester, and Local No. 295, of Winchester, all of the International Fur and Leather Workers Union, in the State of Massachusetts, favoring an immediate program so as to solve effectively America's economic needs and compel employers to increase wages without any accompanying increase in the cost of living; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A resolution adopted by the members of the Department of Social Service of the Diocese of Massachusetts, Boston, Mass., protesting against the enactment of legislation providing for peacetime universal military training, to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Resolutions adopted by members of the Massachusetts Clerical Association comprising the clergy of the Episcopal Diocese, and the Episcopal Evangelical Fellowship, both of Boston, Mass., favoring the enactment of legislation providing for international control of atomic energy; to the Special Committee on Atomic Energy.

MISSOURI VALLEY AUTHORITY—RESOLUTION OF OMAHA (NEBR.) RIVER DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, Wilbur A. Jones, president of the Omaha (Nebr.) River Development Association, handed to me a resolution adopted by that association relating to the Missouri Valley Authority. I ask unanimous consent to present the resolution for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Committee on Agriculture of the United States Senate, of which Senator ELMER THOMAS is chairman, is considering the Murray bill (S. 555) for the creation of a Missouri Valley Authority, the Omaha River Development Association, through its executive committee, at a meeting held in Omaha November 16, 1945, records its vigorous opposition to the measure for the following reasons:

1. The bill grants to three men not elected by the people legislative, judicial, and executive powers, contrary to our conception of government. There is no provision in the bill for their removal.

2. The bill places in jeopardy all of our State and Federal laws governing the use of water in a flood-control and irrigation development program.

3. Thousands of American men are returning from military to civilian life and are now looking for work. The Pick-Sloan plan of development is ready to go now, and to pass the Murray bill would be to delay the start of the program for probably as much as 5 years.

4. The present (Pick-Sloan) program is in capable hands and coordination of the various phases of the program is being obtained through the interagency committee. The acts of Congress of last December and of last March constitute a satisfactory water bill of rights and define the area of activity of each agency and integrate the programs of the experienced agencies of government. They detract in no way from the basic laws under which Congress has always guided these agencies that have become, at home and abroad, the most effective to be found anywhere in their respective fields.

Therefore we ask that the Murray bill be rejected and that appropriations be made speedily for the immediate prosecution of the present development program of the Missouri River Basin.

OMAHA RIVER DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION,
WILBUR A. JONES, *President.*

PROTEST AGAINST USE OF GRAINS AND SUGAR IN MANUFACTURE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received a resolution by the Fifth District of Kansas Federation of Women's

Clubs, assembled at Wichita, Kans., taking a stand against the use of grains and sugar by brewers for the manufacture of intoxicating liquors. I ask unanimous consent to present the resolution and that it be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the brewers are receiving grains and sugar to manufacture intoxicating liquors; and

Whereas, it has been scientifically proven that alcoholic liquors are detrimental to the health of American people and welfare of the American Home; and

Whereas homemakers are deprived of necessary sugar for domestic use: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Fifth District of Kansas Federation of Women's Clubs assembled at Wichita, Kans., October 19, 1945, That the Federal Government restrict the use of sugars for such purposes.

Mrs. FLOYD TURNER,
Mrs. W. H. VONDER HEIDEN,
Mrs. ROY E. THOMAS,
Resolutions Committee.

FOOT AND MOUTH AND OTHER CATTLE DISEASES—RESOLUTION OF AMERICAN VETERINARY MEDICAL ASSOCIATION

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received from F. E. Mullen, executive secretary of the American Live Stock Association, Denver, Colo., a resolution adopted by the American Veterinary Medical Association calling attention to the dangers of foot and mouth diseases. I ask unanimous consent to present the resolution for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas through the highly efficient efforts of veterinarians working in close cooperation with livestock producers our country has been placed in a most enviable position with regard to the health and condition of our livestock herds and flocks; and

Whereas this condition has been made possible only at great sacrifice to our livestock producers and at great cost to both State and Federal Government; and

Whereas one of the greatest contributions that veterinarians and the livestock industry of this country can make to the war effort is to insure a continuing ample supply of meat, meat products and dairy products to our armed forces and our civilian population; and

Whereas all industries and people in our country would be adversely affected by a disastrous or dangerous disease becoming epizootic in our livestock, for as agriculture goes so goes the Nation; and

Whereas any step lessening the safeguards applying to importations of live animals or dressed meats or unsterilized meat food products from countries where foot-and-mouth disease, rinderpest, surra, or contagious pleuropneumonia or other equally dangerous diseases exist would constitute a grave hazard to our livestock industry and to wild animal life, and to our present and future food supply: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Veterinary Medical Association do most earnestly and sincerely appeal to the Congress of the United States and to all Federal and State officials to strengthen present laws and regulations pertaining to imports from such countries and we most emphatically warn against the calamity that undoubtedly will result if there is any lessening of the embargo provisions of the present law.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BALL (for Mr. SMITH), from the Committee on Education and Labor:

S. J. Res. 89. Joint resolution relative to the formation of an International Health Organization; with an amendment (Rept. No. 782).

By Mr. ELLENDER:

From the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 566. A bill relating to the domestic raising of fur-bearing animals; with amendments (Rept. No. 783).

From the Committee on Claims:

S. 1338. A bill for the relief of Wayne Edward Wilson, a minor; with amendments (Rept. No. 792).

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 704. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to continue administration of and ultimately liquidate Federal rural rehabilitation projects, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 784).

By Mr. BILBO, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 1471. A bill to transfer certain land and personal property in Limestone County, Tex., to the State of Texas, acting by and through the State board of control; without amendment (Rept. No. 785).

By Mr. McFARLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 342. A bill to amend section 5296 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the discharge of indigent convicts for nonpayment of fines; without amendment (Rept. No. 786);

S. 343. A bill to amend section 35 of the act of July 1, 1898, entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," as amended (11 U. S. C. 63), so as to remove the legal incompatibility between the office of United States commissioner and referee in bankruptcy; without amendment (Rept. No. 787);

S. 344. A bill to prescribe and furnish to United States commissioners standard forms and dockets and to furnish United States Code and seal; without amendment (Rept. No. 788);

S. 345. A bill concerning the method of payment of the compensation of United States commissioners; without amendment (Rept. No. 789);

S. 346. A bill to amend section 21 of the act of May 28, 1896 (29 Stat. 184; 28 U. S. C., sec. 597), prescribing fees of United States commissioners; without amendment (Rept. No. 790); and

H. R. 2465. A bill to amend section 20 of the act of May 28, 1896 (29 Stat. 184; 28 U. S. C. 527), so as to provide that nothing therein contained shall preclude a referee in bankruptcy or a national park commissioner from appointment also as a United States commissioner; without amendment (Rept. No. 791).

By Mr. O'DANIEL, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 905. A bill for the relief of Harold E. Bullock; with amendments (Rept. No. 793); and

S. 1294. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Allan F. Walker; with an amendment (Rept. No. 794).

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 976. A bill for the relief of Mildred E. Hooper; without amendment (Rept. No. 796).

By Mr. CAPPER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1480. A bill for the relief of Charles R. Hooper; without amendment (Rept. No. 796).

TERMINATION OF RATIONING OF BUTTER, OLEOMARGARINE, FATS, OILS, AND MEATS

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry I ask unanimous consent to report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 185, which was submitted by me on November 8, and was improperly referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and then on motion which I made a few days ago was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Almost simultaneously with the ordering of the committee this morning of a favorable report of this resolution, which calls for the end of rationing of butter, oleomargarine, fats, oils, and meats, the OPA and the Department of Agriculture announced, and the announcement has already been made public and appears in the newspapers, the fact that rationing is ended, as of midnight tonight, I believe, on all fats, oils, meats, butter, and oleomargarine. Nevertheless, in compliance with the direction from the chairman of the committee, I ask unanimous consent to report the resolution and request that it be spread on the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the resolution reported by the Senator from Tennessee will be received and placed on the calendar, and, without objection, the resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution (S. Res. 185) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the United States military services and other Government agencies have recently released for public consumption in the United States 100,000,000 pounds of high-quality creamery butter; and

Whereas the Department of Agriculture has seen fit to sell 8,000,000 pounds of creamery butter in foreign markets; and

Whereas 100,000,000 pounds of creamery butter added to current commercial stocks and expected production during November and December 1945 will provide at least 150,000,000 pounds of creamery butter for each such month; and

Whereas 150,000,000 pounds a month is more than enough to provide for all unrestricted domestic civilian consumption of high-quality creamery butter during November and December and provide for an adequate year end carry-over; and

Whereas the production of butter begins to increase in December, due to seasonal factors, and continues to increase monthly for the ensuing 6 months; and

Whereas civilians will have the entire United States butter production available for their use during 1946, with the exception of very small quantities which will be purchased by the United States military services; and

Whereas oleomargarine, which is used for the same purpose, is in surplus supply, and

Whereas there will continue to be sufficient fats and oils available to produce supplies of oleomargarine equal to the demand for it; and

Whereas the current civilian allocation of other fats and oils, including lard, is at the highest rate since the initiation of fats and oils rationing; and

Whereas shortening, salad, and cooking oils are being produced in quantities greater than at any time since regulations were imposed and in quantities greater than those produced prior to the war; and

Whereas the supply of raw materials needed to produce shortening, salad, and cooking oils will continue to be sufficient to maintain this production; and

Whereas the production of lard, one of the chief fats and oils, will be substantially increased beginning not later than November 1, due to the seasonal increase in hog slaughter; and

Whereas the availability of supply is now sufficient to provide as much fats and oils as has ever before been consumed in this country during a peacetime period; and

Whereas the total domestic production of fats and oils, including lard, during 1946 will be available for civilian consumption, except for very small quantities which will be purchased by the United States military services; and

Whereas meat supplies in the United States at the present time are admittedly available at the annual rate of 159 pounds per capita and will continue to be available at this rate for the remainder of the year; and

Whereas meat supplies in this quantity are greater than were ever before available in the United States during any prewar period; and

Whereas meat supplies will be available during 1946 at a rate far in excess of the quantity consumed at any previous time; and

Whereas the supplies of poultry, eggs, fish, and cheese are abundant; and

Whereas the military has ceased purchasing poultry, eggs, fish, and cheese; and

Whereas the large supplies of poultry, eggs, fish, and cheese will supplement the supplies of meat available for civilian consumption in the United States; and

Whereas the continuation of rationing of butter, oleomargarine, fats, and oils, and meat is causing hoarding, maldistribution, and disruption of normal marketing; and

Whereas the expense of continuing rationing is no longer warranted; and

Whereas industry is capable of reestablishing normal distribution of these commodities: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate of the United States that the Department of Agriculture should order the Office of Price Administration to cease rationing of butter, oleomargarine, fats, and oils, and meat as soon as is practicable, but in no case later than December 1, 1945.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 1614. A bill relating to the discharge status of members and former members of the Army Air Forces Enlisted Reserve Corps who have participated in the Civil Aeronautics Administration war-training-service program; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VANDENBERG:

S. 1615. A bill providing for the release of a portion of Marquette National Forest for private use and development; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 1616. A bill establishing a special Housing Bureau in the Veterans' Administration to act in relation to the procurement of homes or farms for war veterans, and to liberalize loan conditions pertaining thereto, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself and Mr. ROBERTSON):

S. 1617. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the States of Utah, Idaho, and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact for the division of the waters of the Bear River and its tributaries; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 1618. A bill to exempt the Navy Department from statutory prohibitions against the employment of noncitizens, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

(Mr. WALSH also introduced Senate bill 1619, to extend the effectiveness of title B of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MEAD:

S. 1620. A bill to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the bicentennial anniversary of the birth of Commodore John Barry, "Father of the American Navy"; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

(Mr. TYDINGS introduced Senate Joint Resolution 119, to provide for national elections in the Philippine Islands, which was referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. TAFT introduced Senate Joint Resolution 120, amending the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 relating to the standards by which maximum prices shall be established, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. TAFT introduced Senate Joint Resolution 121, to provide for an embargo on the shipment out of the United States of new automobile and truck tires and tubes, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and appears under a separate heading.)

WAIVER OF NAVIGATION AND VESSEL INSPECTION LAWS

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for reference to the Committee on Naval Affairs a bill to extend the effectiveness of title V of the Second War Powers Act of 1942.

A brief explanation should be made, because this bill would make some contribution to the demobilization program.

Title V of the Second War Powers Act of 1942 authorizes waiver of compliance with the navigation and vessel inspection laws.

This title expires on December 31, 1945, and unless renewed, would require vessels transporting troops home to comply with all of the navigation and vessel inspection laws. There are, for example, 200 Liberty ships now used to carry 550 troops each, and 97 Victory ships converted to carry approximately 1,500 troops each. If those vessels were required to meet navigation and inspection laws they would carry only approximately 12 men each.

Unless the authority contained in title V is extended as proposed in the bill, the operation of returning overseas personnel and equipment to this country would be seriously retarded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and refered to the Comittee on Naval Affairs as requested by the Senator from Massachusetts.

The bill (S. 1619) to extend the effectiveness of title V of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. WALSH, was read twice by its title and refered to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

ELECTIONS FOR NATIONAL ELECTIVE OFFICES IN THE PHILIPPINES

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I have in my hand a letter from the President of the United States, which I should like to have read from the desk.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the clerk will read as requested.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, November 23, 1945.

Hon. MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
Chairman, Committee on Territories, and Insular Affairs, United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR TYDINGS: I am writing you because there has developed an emergency problem with respect to the elections for national elective offices which are necessary in the Philippine Islands.

Under the Constitution of the Philippines, the terms of all of the members of the house of representatives and of two-thirds of the members of the senate of the Philippine Congress expire on December 30, 1945. The term of President Osmeña, under the joint resolution of November 12, 1943, continues until a successor has been elected and qualified. It was not possible to hold the elections which the constitution fixes in November 1945. There is no provision, in that constitution, for such elections to be held at any other time.

Accordingly, it seems highly desirable that the United States Congress enact legislation to deal with the situation before it adjourns for the holidays.

I enclose for your consideration a draft of a joint resolution which I believe would meet the need. This draft provides that elections shall be held for national elective offices not later than April 30, 1946, with the newly elected president, vice president, and congress taking office not later than May 28, 1946, and with the newly elected congress convening in regular session not later than the same date. The present Philippine Congress is authorized to fix the date of the elections and date for the convening of the newly elected congress in regular session, and the dates fixed shall not be subsequent to April 30, 1946, and May 28, 1946, respectively. Should the Philippine Congress fail to fix such dates, then the dates are fixed by this joint resolution. The elections are to be under Philippine law and provision is made for dividing the newly elected Senators into those having 4- and those having 6-year terms, so that hereafter the elected senators will hold office for the regular 6 years. The preamble contains explanatory and clarifying recitals.

The Secretary of the Interior, the High Commissioner to the Philippines, and the President of the Philippines have joined in recommending that legislation along this line be enacted.

I have written a similar letter to the chairman of the Committee on Insular Affairs, House of Representatives.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, inasmuch as the suggestion by the President of the United States for legislation is in response to a request of the President of the Commonwealth of the Philippines, I take pleasure in asking unanimous consent to introduce a joint resolution to carry into effect the purport of the latter just read. I request unanimous consent that the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD at this point, and then referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs of the Senate.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 119) to provide for national elections in the Philippine Islands was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on

Territories and Insular Affairs, as follows:

Whereas the interruption of constitutional processes of government in the Philippine Islands, due to enemy occupation, has prevented the holding of elections in 1943 and 1945 as provided by the constitution of the Philippines; and

Whereas the term of office of the President of the Philippines has been continued by the joint resolution of November 12, 1943 (57 Stat. 590), until such time as a successor has been elected and qualified; and

Whereas the Philippine Congress, under the terms of the constitution of the Philippines, cannot convene after December 30, 1945, because the terms of office of members of the house of representatives and of two-thirds of the members of the Philippine Senate will have expired on that date; and

Whereas the liberation of the Philippines and the restoration of constitutional processes of democracy in the Commonwealth now permit the holding of an election in the immediate future; and

Whereas the members of the electoral commission responsible for the conduct of the elections have already been appointed by the Commonwealth government in accordance with the constitution and laws of the Commonwealth; and

Whereas the constitution of the Commonwealth of the Philippines makes no provision for the emergency in which elections, though of vital necessity, cannot be held at the regularly scheduled time; and

Whereas it is the desire of the United States to fulfill her pledge to prepare the Philippines for independence and to make possible that grant of independence in accordance with existing now: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That elections shall be held for national elective offices under the Commonwealth of the Philippines not later than April 30, 1946. The present Philippine Congress shall fix the date for such elections, and the date fixed shall not be subsequent to April 30, 1946. Should the present Philippine Congress fail to fix such date, then April 30, 1946, is hereby fixed as the date elections shall be held for national elective offices under the Commonwealth of the Philippines.

SEC. 2. The president and vice president then elected, the senators then elected (who shall be all but those then in office whose terms continue until December 30, 1947), and the members of the house of representatives shall take office, and the elected Philippine Congress shall convene in regular session not later than May 28, 1946. The present Philippine Congress shall fix the date or dates for the assumption of office and for the convening of the elected Philippine Congress in regular session, and the date or dates fixed shall not be subsequent to May 28, 1946. Should the present Philippine Congress fail to fix such date or dates, then May 28, 1946, is hereby fixed as the date for assumption of office and the convening of the elected Philippine Congress in regular session.

SEC. 3. The terms of office of the president, vice president, and representatives then elected shall expire on the date which would have been the case had they assumed office on December 30, 1945. The terms of office of eight of the Senator elected at such elections shall expire on the date which would have been the case had they assumed office on December 30, 1945, and the terms of eight senators then elected shall expire on the date which would have been the case had they assumed office on December 30, 1943. Division of the senators elected at such elections into these two classes shall be made in accordance with the constitution and laws of the Commonwealth of the Philippines. The term of any senator then elected to fill a vacancy in a term expiring on December 30, 1947, shall expire on that date.

SEC. 4. The manner of holding such elections shall be as provided by the constitution and laws of the Commonwealth of the Philippines.

PROPOSED EMBARGO ON EXPORT OF AUTOMOBILE AND TRUCK TIRES AND TUBES

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a joint resolution and have it appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 121) to provide for an embargo on the shipment out of the United States of new automobile and truck tires and tubes, introduced by Mr. YOUNG, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, the joint resolution which I have introduced would provide an embargo on the shipment of new automobile and truck tires out of the United States for a period of 6 months after the enactment of the joint resolution, except in the case of Government agencies. It would also provide a penalty consisting of a fine of not more than $10,000 for any person violating the provisions of the act.

I can see no logical reason for the shipment abroad during the last quarter of 1945 of more than half a million tires and tubes for trucks and automobiles, at a time when critical shortages of these essential items exist all over the United States.

These shortages are especially critical in the agricultural States of the Midwest, where automobile travel is necessary in conducting everyday business; where farmers use their cars every day to take their children to school; where markets are usually from 10 to 25 miles distant, and frequently much farther; and where the nearest doctor is often 40 or 50 miles away. The situation is even worse in Montana. Truck tires are even more essential in the conduct of everyday business in that area. In my own State of North Dakota we produced more than 350,000,000 bushels of small grains and potatoes last year, and practically all of it had to be trucked to market. Our production this year is even greater. A large proportion of the two and a half million head of cattle, sheep, and hogs which North Dakota farmers will take to market this year also will go by truck. Yet at this time a tire certificate is not much more than a mere piece of paper, when tires cannot be found. I feel that we should make sure that our own essential tire and tube needs are met before we ship such commodities abroad.

APPOINTMENT OF AMERICAN REPRESENTATIVES IN UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION—AMENDMENTS

Mr. TAFT submitted three amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1580) to provide for the appointment of representatives of the United States in the organs and agencies of the United Nations, and to make other provision with respect to the participation of the United States in such organization, which were severally ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 4489) to extend certain privileges, exemptions, and immunities to international organizations and to the officers and employees thereof, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

NATIONAL HOUSING—ADDRESS BY SENATOR ELLENDER

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the subject National Housing, delivered by Senator ELLENDER on November 20, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

STATEMENT ON PALESTINE BY HON. GUY M. GILLETTE, REPRESENTATIVE ANDREW L. SOMERS, AND DAVID STERN

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the statement issued by Hon. Guy M. Gillette, Representative Andrew J. Somers, and J. David Stern on the eve of their departure to London on behalf of the American League for a Free Palestine, which appears in the Appendix.]

STATEMENTS IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS OF MR. ATTLEE AND MR. EDEN

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of the remarks of Hon. Clement R. Attlee, Prime Minister of Great Britain, and extracts from the remarks of Hon. Anthony Eden, on the subject of foreign relations, which appear in the Appendix.]

THOUGHTS AND WISHES OF THE MAN IN THE STREET—ADDRESS BY ROBERT E. HANNEGAN

[Mr. DOWNEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Robert E. Hannegan, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, at a dinner of the Indiana Democratic Editorial Association, at French Lick, Ind., November 17, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

GALLUP POLL OF VETERANS ON PEACETIME MILITARY TRAINING

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the Gallup poll entitled "War Veterans Found Strong for Peacetime Army Training," published in the Washington Post of November 21, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

ATTAINMENT OF UNIVERSAL PEACE BY THE RULE OF LAW

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, Senate bill 1580, the bill providing necessary implementing legislation to effect our active participation in the United Nations Organization, was made the unfinished business of the Senate Tuesday. On account of the holiday, I am told it was agreed no action would be taken on the measure until Monday. Due to a long-standing engagement in New Mexico, it is necessary for me to leave Washington on Sunday. It will, therefore, be impossible for me to be here during the debate on the bill. I regret very much this forced absence at this particular time, for I am intensely interested in seeing the bill enacted into law quickly. I feel certain it will be. Nevertheless, because of my interest in the measure and the entire world situation, I am taking this opportunity to discuss some of the matters involved in the pending measure and others of immediate concern to all of us.

Senate bill 1580, together with our active participation in the United Nations Organization, constitutes a departure

from the course our Nation has previously followed. This departure is a wise one in that it will enable us to participate in world affairs in times of peace. With the passage of the pending bill, we can participate even to the extent of using force, if necessary, to prevent war. Instead of waiting for war to come, we shall now act in advance and, by so doing, perhaps, prevent war.

It may be anticipated that some question will arise as to that section of the bill which confers authority on the President to utilize armed forces for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security in accordance with section 43 of the San Francisco Charter. As to the constitutional right of the President to so use our armed forces, I do not entertain the slightest doubt.

The Supreme Court has more than once upheld the authority of the President to use our armed forces without specific congressional authority, in cases falling short of a state of war, as in the case of physical attack, or the immediate danger of such attack, upon American citizens or upon the agencies or property of Government, here and abroad. That such use of our troops has been more or less ordinary practice, is a matter of common knowledge. In international affairs the President is allowed far greater latitude, as has been expressly held by the courts in more than one decision.

In this day of undeclared war and surprise attacks, this power of the Executive must be recognized, and, certainly, there must be no curtailment of clearly valid constitutional power.

Senate bill 1580 merely grants in advance congressional authority to the President to do that which may be necessary in order to protect against certain contingencies, a power which the courts have recognized now in large degree rests in the President. If anything, the pending bill may, in a way, limit rather than expand present Executive authority.

Mr. President, this bill does not constitute a long step toward complete international collaboration, but it is an essential one. It, with other steps the world has taken, represents the minimum the nations should do. So strong is my conviction that we must go far beyond what is being done, I might, with some logic and reason, oppose S. 1580 because it does not go far enough. That, Mr. President, is not my purpose. I do not oppose or criticize this measure. On the contrary, I approve it, as I approve the other steps we have taken. My regret is that we do not do more.

Mr. President, in spite of VE-day, notwithstanding VJ-day, many look at the world now with grave misgivings. Many thinking people entertain substantial fear as to the present and for the future. That fear is based only in part upon the recent discovery of the use of atomic energy and the making of the most terrible and deadly weapon of war man has as yet devised. There are other weapons capable of almost as much destructive force as the bomb, and no person knows what science may further discover and reveal.

In the article the Atomic Bomb and American Security, by Richard Bernard Brodie, appearing in the Yale Institute of National Studies, an article which I am sure has been sent to every Senator, and which, incidentally, is worthy of careful study by all of us, this direful statement, concurred in by nearly all scientists, is made:

> Scientific knowledge today embraces no hint of a possibility of neutralizing the atomic bomb; it does contain signposts pointing to the possible exploitation of other and equally horrendous means of destroying human life, such as radio-active gases.

In his report discussing some of the possibilities of future development, Prof. H. D. Smyth, chairman of the department of physics of Princeton University, says:

> From the military point of view it is reasonably certain that there will be improvements both in the processes of producing fissionable material and in its use. It is conceivable that totally different methods may be discovered for converting matter into energy since it is to be remembered that the energy released in uranium fission corresponds to the utilization of only about one-tenth of 1 percent of its mass. Should a scheme be devised for converting to energy even as much as a few percent of the matter of some common material, civilization would have the means to commit suicide at will.

Such discoveries as await in the future, with those already made, have so changed every previous concept, we, as molders of policy, must radically revise former opinions and plan and legislate in the light of things as they are and will be—not as we might wish they were. Frankly, minimum action, such as the world seems to contemplate in present efforts to preserve peace, may be prophetic of continued minimum endeavor in the future. Such lassitude could well mean total disaster.

Our times do not call for minimum effort. They call loudly and vigorously for—nay, they demand—the maximum effort of all nations and all peoples if civilization is to survive. The minimum in this day of unheralded, undreamed-of progress in the art of killing will not suffice.

Mr. President, this is no fault-finding statement. This is no time for captious criticism. It is time to devote every bit of our energy and intelligence, in cooperation with other nations, to finding the best possible plan to prevent the great discoveries of science from being used to destroy all of us. For, such are the portents which confront the world.

I do not propose now to discuss the atomic bomb nor the terrible havoc and disaster it may forebode. The debris and death at Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the yawning cavern in New Mexico, with its once-steel tower completely vaporized, speak a universal language. It may be the language of doom. All people know what actually happened when our scientists, with others, crossed the border of the unknown into that universal sphere never before entered by mortal being.

I do propose to discuss, in connection with atomic energy and other tremendous forces of destruction, some of the problems which confront us as legislators. First, let me say that intimate scientific knowledge of the bomb and atomic energy is not necessary for the task before us. This is emphasized in the report to which I have referred and in which Professor Smyth says:

> We find ourselves with an explosive which is far from completely perfected. Yet the future possibilities of such explosives are appalling, and their effects on future wars and international affairs are of fundamental importance. Here is a new tool for mankind, a tool of unimaginable destructive power. Its development raises many questions that must be answered in the near future.
>
> Because of the restrictions of military security there has been no chance for the Congress or the people to debate such questions. They have been seriously considered by all concerned and vigorously debated among the scientists, and the conclusions reached have been passed along to the highest authorities. These questions are not technical questions; they are political and social questions and the answers given to them may affect all mankind for generations.

Professor Smyth further says decisions as to policy, use, and control must be made by the people, acting through their representatives. That, Mr. President, is the question, the political, moral, and social question which we must answer. They are not questions with which we can delay. We live now in a brief period of grace. It is running fast. Let it not expire through our lack of vision or lack of action.

The world for many generations has scoffed at and scorned the Nero who fiddled while Rome burned. Descendants of the surviving remnants of our generation may read our history as one which fiddled while an entire civilization died.

Do I speak as one who is disturbed? I am disturbed. I am disturbed because in nearly every suggestion reliance upon power, upon force and strength of military might to keep civilization safe and secure is stressed. That course is the course which has always led to war. It is the survival of the fittest, of the strongest. But, are we the fit and strong now? At the moment we are, but, when we unloosed the atomic bomb, we actually lessened the security of our own great strength. We, ourselves, became far more vulnerable than ever before.

Whatever may have been true in the past, the discovery of atomic energy and other forces equally destructive which await discovery and development, make it now impossible for any nation to isolate itself from the rest of the world. Great strength may prove to be a great weakness.

Whether we like it or not, we are actually being forced into one world. That statement is, perhaps, a little short of the actual truth. We are already in one world. Debate, misgivings, and fears on that point are relegated to the past. The question we have to answer, the decision we and the other nations have to make, is: What kind of world shall this one world be? Right decisions, proper courses, cooperative action, can make a world of peace, plenty, and prosperity. We can choose that kind of world or we can choose a world of destruction and death.

We have already agreed, and rightly so, that atomic energy and other means of mass destruction must not be used

for military purposes. Just as soon as proper international controls can be set up, we shall share with other nations the knowledge which we, Great Britain, and Canada now possess. Again I repeat, this is right. According to every authority, any hope that we might permanently retain the secret is vain and entirely unreliable.

Acting under undisputed constitutional authority, the President has submitted a plan to other nations providing, in effect, for control of atomic power through the United Nations Organization, an international body. When we grant control of atomic energy to the international organization, under whatever forms and details may be agreed upon finally, we are actually setting up a world government. We are delegating national sovereignty to an extent the quibblers had not even guessed a few short months ago.

Yet, so tremendous has been the impact of the atomic bomb upon the peoples of the world that even the most skeptical agree that such unbelievable force can be safely controlled only in a true international set-up. In providing such control, we automatically submit to a form of world government.

In an article by Prof. Richard Schlegel of the research staff of the Palmer Physical Laboratory at Princeton University, there is set forth something of the far-reaching effect of an international agreement for the control of atomic energy. Professor Schlegel says in part:

> If the nations give up the right to use atomic power for military purposes, they to a large extent give up their right to make war. For modern war is not fought as a rough international game, within the bounds of certain rules. Rather, every conceivable resource of destruction is employed. If possession of atomic-energy weapons is the exclusive prerogative of an international authority, every nation will be inferior to the supreme military power of that authority. Thus international control of atomic energy is equivalent to the creation of an international governing body to which the individual nations have surrendered their sovereign right to make war. In effect, the international control of atomic power will bring a world authority which can enforce universal peace.

Acting under stern necessity, we are already taking the preliminary steps to place atomic energy under control of an international authority, and that, as Professor Schlegel says, is equivalent to the creation of an international governing body. In this thought, I agree. And, with the end, namely that of world organization, actually being forced upon us by atomic energy, I heartily approve. Indeed, the awful, destructive, deadly force of atomic energy, which at first so frightened all of us, may in the end prove to be the means, force, or cause, by which nations will be compelled to cease and abandon their wanton destruction of each other. Strange as it may be, actual fear and terror, the horror of total destruction, may be man's best hope of peace. Perhaps I am wrong in saying that fear itself can constitute hope. Perhaps it would be better to put it, that the grim, ghastly necessities of self-preservation constitute the hope of men. After all, necessity has been the basis of some of the most outstanding achievements of the human race. The old saying that "necessity is the mother of invention," has been true for generations. Today, necessity may be the mother of permanent peace.

In being blasted into a form of world government by fear and necessity, as we have been, we are entering an association which will necessarily expand and grow throughout the years to come. The only question now is: How much control or how much government can we agree upon now? What is essential?

The other day, in connection with control and law, I quoted from the excellent editorial Modern Man Is Obsolete, written by Norman Cousins and now published in book form. In the quotation I used, it was said:

> But reject all other arguments for world government; reject the geographic, economic, the idealogical, the sociological, the humanitarian arguments, valid though they may be. Conside only the towering job of policing the atom—the job of keeping the smallest particle of matter from destroying all matter. This means control. But control is no natural phenomenon. It does not operate of and by itself. Control is impossible without power—the power of investigation, the power of injunction, the power of arrest, the power of punishment.
>
> But power, like control, cannot be isolated, nor is it desirable except under carefully defined circumstances. Power must be subordinate to law, unless it is to take the form of brute, irresponsible force. Here, too, we are involved in an important interrelationship, because law can be derived only through government. Law is a product of moral, judicial, executive, legislative, and administrative sanction—all of which adds up to government. And government means what it says: the process of governing. It is not a decentralization, it is not informal organization, it is not the right of veto or the right of secession by any state or states. It is a central body none of whose members has the right or the means of aggression or withdrawal. It is the source of legitimate action and legitimate redress.

The reasoning of Mr. Cousins is most convincing. Ultimately, the nations of the world will agree upon a strong world-wide government. When that will be, none of us can now foretell. Our task today involves, as Secretary Byrnes said in his address at Charleston just recently, the use of such machinery and means as we have at hand. In fact, we must use the machinery we now have, improving it as best we can, making every needed amendment and change as we progress toward the ultimate goal of complete world-wide rule by law instead of rule by force. Many are the suggestions as to how this may be accomplished.

Recently someone sent me a most interesting book by Emery Reves, entitled "The Anatomy of Peace." While there is much in the book with which I do not agree, I was tremendously impressed with the chapter Treaty or Law. Every Member of Congress might profitably read the entire book, and especially those chapters devoted to law among nations. Among other equally, if not more important and stronger-expressed statements, the author says:

> Quite certainly peace is not a utopia.
>
> The only question is, What kind of peace?
>
> If we seek peace between X sovereign units, based on treaty agreements, then peace is an impossibility and it is childish even to think of it. But if we conceive peace correctly, as order based on law, then peace is a practical proposition that can be realized just as well between the nation-states as it has been realized so often in the past among states, provinces, cities, principalities, and other units.
>
> Whether we are to have peace or continually recurring war depends on a very simple proposition.
>
> It depends upon whether we want to base international relations on treaties or on law.
>
> If from the Second World War we emerge with another treaty or covenant, the next war may be taken for granted. If we have the foresight, and decide to make that fundamental and revolutionary change in human history, to try to introduce law into the regulation of international relations, then, and not until then, shall be approach an order which may be called peace.
>
> The reason for this is not difficult to understand.
>
> The essence of life is constant change, perpetual development.
>
> Up to now, peace between nations has always been a static conception. We have always tried to determine some sort of status quo, to seal it meticulously in a treaty, and to make any change in that status quo impossible except through war.
>
> This is a grotesque misconception of peace. After having tried it a few thousand times, it may be wise to remember what Francis Bacon said three centuries ago, that "it would be an unsound fancy and self-contradictory to expect that things would have never yet been done can be done except by means which have never yet been tried."
>
> Human society and human evolution, a dynamic phenomenon par excellence, can never be mastered by static means.
>
> Treaties are essentially static instruments.
>
> Law is essentially a dynamic instrument.
>
> Wherever we have applied the method of law to regulate human relationship, it has resulted in peace.
>
> Wherever we have applied treaties to regulate human relationship, it has inevitably led to war.

Mr. President, I do not quote Mr. Reves as an authority. I do not know whether he is or not. I do know that his book reveals profound study and knowledge of the history and the development of civilized man and also of nations. The challenging thoughts so clearly expressed are not to be cast aside lightly.

I wish to express my own emphatic approval of some of the things the author says about diplomacy, diplomats, treaties, and law. With no reflection upon our own officials of state, the President, Secretary Byrnes, and their many able assistants and administrators, I assert that diplomacy, treaties, and all the age-old methods of negotiating peace have miserably failed the world. It is not the men I condemn. Individuals are of small importance. Upon the methods, means, and practices used in the field of international relations rests the blame.

Just the other day the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], valiantly espousing the cause of freedom of the press and of communications, called for frankness and candor in relations between nations. "Lift the iron curtain," he cried, aiming his remarks at our neighbor and ally, Russia. I agree with the Senator, but when has the iron curtain ever been entirely lifted as nations deal with each other in political matters? Have not the doings of various diplomatic corps always been shrouded and

their intrigues concealed by governments not only from other governments but from their own people as well? What do the people of the different countries know today about what is going on behind the diplomatic curtains of the world?

Do not mistake me. I repeat, I do not criticize our State Department nor the President, both of whom are doing all that can be done under the system which prevails in all governments. I do not demand that we adopt a different course by ourselves. We cannot change the world by our single action.

I am condemning the whole system of treaty, alliance, and diplomatic negotiations which have existed for generations. I condemn secrecy, intrigue, and deception in dealings among nations even as I would condemn such practices in dealings among men. I charge that in these things lies the root of most of our misunderstanding, distrust, and suspicion, and I ask, How could it be otherwise? I declare that much of the misery of war and human suffering and sacrifice on the battlefields have been occasioned by the unholy arts of so-called diplomatic dealings among nations.

It is not that I decry—and certainly I do not belittle—the necessity for many agreements, treaties, and understandings among and between nations. There must and there always will be such agreements. They simply amount to contracts between nations. They are as necessary to national and international dealings as contracts among individuals. Whenever the time comes in the world that treaties and agreements will be solemn, binding, and enforcible according to principle and law and by methods of legal procedure and machinery, the world will have taken a long step away from war and toward peace.

The thing I decry, criticize, and condemn in what I am saying is that heretofore our treaties and agreements have not had binding effect and force, and, when broken, there was no legal method of enforcement. In the case of peace treaties and obligations of that kind, when the treaty has been broken, the only remedy has been war. That is the situation which must be obliterated and driven from the world of nations. It can be done only by radical change and the establishment of procedure and machinery in keeping with the progress of all modern advancement in every other field, and in keeping with the stern realities of actual survival which today confronts every nation in the world.

It is time to change. It is time to try something new. It is time to substitute law instead of force. It is time to adopt complete freedom of thought, communication and of press everywhere in the world. Upon no other basis can a civilized, peaceful world order be built. It is time to adopt and try out that system which is the absolute antithesis and opposite of concealment, deception, intrigue, and their ultimate result—war. It is time for all the world to do away with the "unsound fancy and self-contradictory" which expects "that things which have never yet been done cannot be done except by means which have never yet been tried." The antithesis and opposite of the old method, the method which has not yet been truly tried, is the rule of law. It is for that rule I call and insist today. It is for that rule to which the hopes and yearnings of all the peoples of the world are turned. They want no more killings on inglorious battlefields.

Is it a vain hope in which the world indulges? It has been. The failure of its achievement is written in the blood of every man who has died in battle. In the failure to achieve it in the future may be written the death of all civilization.

Obstacles? Yes; there are many. Difficulties? Yes; they are great. I do not underestimate the task which lies ahead. Languages—a thousand different tongues; races and creeds—without number; customs and habits—without end; hatreds, suspicions, and distrust—as many almost as there are nations and tribes; poverty and wealth—they exist everywhere.

The difficulties just mentioned may seem vague and rather indefinite. "Why not be specific?" may be asked. "Why not mention other countries?" Well, why not? They are not taboo with me. Without going too deeply into diplomatic channels, some troublesome things might well be discussed.

There are and there will continue to be difficulties with other nations. To accept the new, to renounce power and adopt law, will be troublesome for many nations, including our own. The use of the great military power that we, Russia, and Great Britain possess today, will not be easy to forego. The temptation to impose our will upon the rest of the world will be great. But we must forego the use of military strength except to preserve peace and prevent aggression. We must resist the age-old temptation to dominate and rule, a temptation to which many an empire of the past yielded and by yielding perished. If we do not so forego power and resist temptation, if we do not continue to work together valiantly for peace, if we do not cooperate to drive force from the world and substitute law therefor, chaos awaits all the world. If we ever discontinue the unity which gave us victory in battle, and go our separate ways, be assured we shall perish, not separately, but all together. As poor, blind Samson of old, we may easily pull down the pillars of the temple, but we shall surely die together.

Why can we not continue together? Do we, who fought so well together in war, now fear each other in peace? Why should we fear any nation? Why should any nation fear us? Why, for example, should Russia fear us? Or, why should we fear Russia? Russia has not a single thing we require except her good will and her continued strong cooperation for a just peace in every country of the world. There is no reason why our paths should cross. We have nothing Russia must have from us, that she cannot obtain through peaceful, friendly negotiation, but never through violence. Russia needs to acquire no territory by conquest. Within her borders lies ample room to expand and develop for a hundred years to come. Plain commonsense, ordinary intelligence, friendly relations of long standing, mutual gain, advantage, and prosperity, all demand continued peaceful, friendly relations among all the Allied Nations. Both our strong allies, England and Russia, require peace, not a temporary cessation of hostilities, an armistice, but a long peace, or, better still, an era to repair the damage of war and build for the future even as do we here in this vast, prosperous country of ours. Such things a world of law and order will promote and secure. Without law and order, such peaceful, prosperous ways and times will perish in the dread holocaust of a race of men consumed and destroyed by forces of its own creation.

It is true that misunderstandings appear to have arisen among nations. There are those in our own country and in Russia who seem to fear and distrust each other. Irritations have existed. Why, and of instances, it is not for me to speak at this time. The general situation—the long-time view—not of present friction, if any exists, is my theme. But well do I know that minor friction, not properly healed, may lead to major fracture. Frankly, all the countries of Europe lay too much stress upon so-called national boundaries between friendly adjoining countries. Some even insist on trying to dominate internal affairs of neighboring nations. Such things are sores which perhaps cannot be avoided during the transition period through which we are now passing. But they have no place in this present age.

Mr. President, it is not my purpose now to place blame upon anyone. But it is true that many students of international affairs clearly see a grave danger to permanent world accord in present unilateral steps being aggressively taken by the Soviet Union. Others declare Great Britain is following in some places a similar course. Even we are accused of like policies in certain areas. No matter which nation pursues such course, it is wrong. It will destroy that unity of action which the world needs more than anything else to prevent world war three. Unilateral action is not only a serious blow to our present United Nations Organization, but it is almost a death knell for a world order based upon the principles of law for which I so earnestly contend today.

Only yesterday in an article entitled "From Bad to Worse," Walter Lippmann wrote:

> It is clear that toward the second week of the London Conference—about September 22—there was a decision in Moscow to reduce to a minimum the business of settling affairs by means of international conference.

He added:

> There was no break in diplomatic relations but there has been what is tantamount to a break in diplomatic intercourse. Soviet officials abroad took a line which came very near to being one of nonparticipation in the machinery of international action which exists to deal with the postwar world.

I wish I could assail Mr. Lippmann for making an unfounded statement. I wish I could assert that he is wrong and only speaks of things which add to present difficulties. Unfortunately, I cannot

assail him, nor can I assert that he is wrong. To many observers his statements appear to approach the truth too close for comfort. I say "comfort" because the world badly needs the assistance of the Soviet Union, just as the Soviet Union needs the assistance of the world. Her help is greatly needed to make the United Nations Organization a success. Some say we cannot proceed without her. Her cooperation and strong support are needed if we are to have any kind of a world based on law and justice. It will be a tragedy for all the world if such unilateral action continues. This tragedy of all tragedies will be because it is such a useless and unnecessary thing. There was a time when, in her defense and in order to survive, she had to wield her vast power and throw all her mighty resources into battle. For her bravery and cooperation with us then, we admire and applaud her. But that time is past. The Soviet Union cannot live a life of isolationism and nationalism, and acheive that rich, full, and complete life to which destiny has definitely pointed her.

By every just and proper means we and other nations, who are minded as we are minded, must convince Russia and every other nation which hesitates to participate in that world order which can alone preserve peace and prevent war, of the folly of nonparticipation. Not with malice, certainly not with anger or animosity, but with strong, candid, and open dealing completely free from guile, intrigue, or deception, the other nations must continue positive leadership, so steadfast, firm, but so fair and so just, that no nation shall hesitate to join in delegating whatever part of national sovereignty is necessary to make this world a world of law, a world of justice, and a world of order.

But what if such leadership does not prove to be successful? This is a natural question. What then? War? Force? What course should then be followed? My answer is that, having exerted the type of leadership suggested, if it does not succeed, there is still a course which the rest of the world can pursue. That course will not be one of retaliation in kind. We shall not return unilateral action with unilateral action. We shall not resort to threats and certainly not to violent measures. Even the atomic bomb, temporarily as it is in our possession, shall not be used to compel action in accord with our wishes.

While it may be a digression, it might be well to reassert here that until proper international controls can be agreed upon we shall use the atomic bomb exactly as President Truman said in his first announcement. That deadly instrument of destruction shall be retained as a sacred trust for the benefit of all nations and used to preserve peace only. It shall never be used to force, compel, destroy, or to further our own interests. Of this, every nation can and must have absolute assurance, for such is not only the mind and will of the President of the United States, but it is the mind and will of the American people.

The course which I am utterly convinced we should and will pursue in the event any nation does refuse to participate and fully collaborate in world unity is a simple one, and one which is right. It is simply for the nations to proceed, leaving out that nation which does so refuse. The rest of us can and shall vigorously progress toward the goal we have set. We will not surrender our ideals. We will not compromise on anything short of complete accord based on law, not on flimsy treaties, simple paper agreements, which would again become mere scraps of paper. I know there are dangers in this course. But we live in a world fraught with danger on every hand. Without minimizing the dangerous aspects of possible disagreement, rebellion, or internal strife, we shall face them frankly, candidly, and declare them to be the lesser of the evils. The progress of mankind shall not be halted by recalcitrant people anywhere. This is no ultimatum. It is the expression of a determined purpose possessed by the overwhelming majority of American men and women, by the great majority of all nations, and the almost unanimous deep and sincere desire of all the peoples of the earth who want no war, save the war on want. We are all thoroughly tired of sending sons to die in battle in times of peril, only to see the same old order reestablished when the peril is passed. We are desperately sick of seeing our sons fight, die, and win, only to have their brave sacrifices rendered nugatory and vain by the stupidity, ignorance, and lack of vision, faith, and intelligence on the part of selfish-minded, politically ambitious, grasping, greedy world statesmen. The people of the world are resolved that this monstrous, savage, cruel, and inhuman thing men call war shall be driven from the earth. Never must it occur again.

This course may seem too difficult. It may require strength and character too great for ordinary mortal beings. But, do we dare act as ordinary beings today? Have we not assumed the garb of immortal gods as we trifle with energies and forces so strong that we may destroy the very planet on which we live? When our scientists, under our instructions and with our support, discovered the source of all power, did they not cross into a realm where only God had trod before? It is written that man may not look upon the face of God and live. It remains to be seen whether man may usurp the power of God and survive.

It is said that the ancient Chinese had a proverb which asks this question:

> What is the use of having a thousand-league horse if you do not have a thousand-league man to ride him?

When our scientists captured the secret of atomic energy, they captured a thousand-league horse which had roamed the ranges of the universe since time began. Now we have seized the force of all forces. It is ours to ride and to utilize as thousand-league men would ride and utilize it.

More than thousand-league men, our responsibilities to all mankind are to use this force as God would use it, for it is His force, His energy and His power. We have tapped that infinite force which some say is the stuff which moves worlds. We have created vital energy from dead mass so powerful that it can destroy every living thing on earth. Such is the force we have loosed among mortal beings. Truly, we must measure up in some degree to those principles of Him in whose image we are created. The old ways of darkness must be abandoned. For war and disorder, the world must substitute the rule of law and order those rules which have ever controlled and governed the universe.

Mr. President, you may call this world government. Up to a certain point, it is. But there is no control of internal affairs and none is contemplated. There is no world citizenship. It is not a super state.

Some very practical knowledge of man's limitations and of his weaknesses lead me not to demand a complete world government now. I know such supergovernment will not burst upon the world in full blossom and full growth. I do not ask, seek, or expect perfection. I ask that we use, to the utmost, the tools and equipment which we now possess, and do that today which present wisdom and judgment permit. Preliminary steps already taken must be continued.

Surely, the nations of the world, building on the structure which they have already started—the San Francisco Charter—can vigorously continue. The first stones necessary in the building of that world government, into which the scientists have already shoved us, whether we concede it or not, must be laid.

We can adopt a code of international law to regulate the external affairs of all nations.

We can establish an international court of justice, giving it compulsory jurisdiction in all juridical matters of international relations as prescribed by and under the code of international law.

We can set up and maintain an international military force to preserve peace among nations, prevent aggression, and enforce the mandates of law and of the international court.

Necessarily, these steps include a strong international police force.

How can these things be accomplished? What of national sovereignty—the greatest of all barriers, the chief cause of war? These are pertinent questions which should be answered. How can this beginning of government by law be made? Actually, we have already started on the road. The able Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], during the discussion on the San Francisco Charter, pointed to the long-time possibilities which lie in the assembly provided by that document. Tracing the growth of the British Parliament, he was suggesting similar development of the United Nations Assembly. With the ultimate suggestion, no one disagrees. Now, under present conditions, exigencies of time and progress, speedier growth is required. The suggestion of a constitutional convention of nations is excellent, but certain practical considerations seem now to prevent such procedure. Probably the nations would not now be willing to adopt a constitution. Vague fear would prevent it. But, Mr. President, the San Francisco Charter should not be scrapped. It must, and should be, amended.

First, the veto right in any one of the great powers must be revised and changed. An organization whose machinery can be stopped and rendered totally useless by the vote of one nation rests upon a foundation so unstable it can hardly endure in the light of things as they are today, although at the time the provisions were adopted at San Francisco it might have seemed altogether different.

The Covenant should be further amended to grant legislative authority to the assembly. Such authority could and should be clearly defined in the amendment to the Charter. The assembly would possess only such power as was expressly conferred. All other power would be expressly reserved to the several nations. But within well defined and clearly established boundaries, the assembly so authorized could enact a code of international law covering every necessary regulation regarding relations among nations. No extensive code would be required. It could be short and simple. One of our great difficulties in thinking along these lines is that we continually stress the difficulties, both intricate and complex, and do not seek simpler approach.

Procedure for the court is already provided. Nations could speed the day of judicial determination by quickly providing for adherence to the court and giving it compulsory jurisdiction, which I believe is absolutely required. The machinery for such is already set up. It needs only to be put into motion.

There may be other and better methods than those I have suggested. If so, they should be adopted. Mine are merely suggestions, often made by others, but worthy, I believe, of utmost consideration. But all of these involve some delegation of national sovereignty. That, I do not dispute. I admit it. Nay, I assert it. I also assert that any world organization involves some delegation of so-called national sovereignty. Of such delegation, I am not afraid. I am a thousand times more afraid to live in our present age, in a world where all sovereignty is retained and kept within the several nations. Where each nation is its own lawmaker, its own judge, and the executioner of its own decrees, nothing but war results. We, with other nations, have clung to the shibboleth of national sovereignty to our own undoing. If nations continue so to cling, destruction may and probably will await all of us.

Adhering to a world organization with the minimum structure for law and order such as I have outlined will be in keeping with evolutionary progress, which began when man first adhered to group or tribe, and eventually to village, city, and state. Each step has involved some delegation of sovereignty; but, with each delegation, greater security, greater benefit and lasting improvement have occurred. In each instance, the delegation has come as a part of evolution and growth. Today we advocate one more step in the development of man—such delegation of external sovereignty as will bring him security against the fear and dread of aggression and war.

We boast of not delegating our sovereignty; that we have never done so and that we will never surrender one iota of it. Idle boasts, foolish talk, and absurd conclusions. We have delegated sovereignty of many kinds and in many different ways.

We did not delegate sovereignty at Pearl Harbor. The Japs took it away from us there. In the Philippines they totally destroyed all the sovereignty this great Nation of our possessed in a land we were in honor bound to protect and preserve against aggression. True, we finally took it back. But, through the long years when American boys were forced into the gruesome death march, into long terms as prisoners of war, ill-treated, starved, cruelly beaten, tortured, some of them slain in horrible, barbaric fashion, where was national sovereignty then? It was not on Bataan, nor on Corregidor. And all this went on while we in the Congress and throughout the country talked of a national sovereignty. If such we possessed, it was preserved only by the bravery of our fighting men on the field of battle. The sovereignty of every son who has died in battle has not been delegated. No; not delegated. It has been completely destroyed. His sovereign right to live the free life of an American citizen, the right to love, to marry, to have a home, to raise a family, to live his allotted span of threescore years and ten, free from fear and free from want, was completely taken from him forever. It is time, I think, that we dwell more on the sovereign rights of men and women to live and to let live, than to quibble over outmoded words, terms, and phrases.

Within the outline I have mentioned and the means I have set forth, can and will be included all the various steps which have been suggested as preventive measures, such as complete inspection within nations of all scientific, industrial, and other activities which might lead to creation of military force and power. Within that outline could also be included all the worthwhile suggestions which have come from many sources.

But our task—the one which lies immediately ahead of us and not in some remote, far-off, distant time—is to choose that course we deem to be wisest and follow it vigorously and determinedly, without doubt or hesitation, until the goal which we establish is attained. That goal, to me, is the one I have announced, to establish law itself as the ruling force in the world.

With such action there must and will come those improved economic relations so necessary in the health and well-being of all humanity. With these, too, shall come educational developments, full exchange and sharing of ideas, knowledge, and scientific discovery, essential to the type of education which ultimately will lead to that culture upon which the foundations of civilization will eventually be built and upon which they must eternally stand.

Mr. President, no longer do I dread the future. In the beginning I said there were grounds for grave fear as one looked at the world today. That is true, but true only if we look at the darkness and the gloom and fail to see the ray of hope that does glimmer through if we but have the wit and wisdom to comprehend the possibilities which actually exist. There are rays of light. The great scientists who have made the world-startling discoveries of force to be used in destruction, can, if given the opportunity, turn those discoveries and many more into benefits of which we do not now dream.

Mr. President, I turn again to the words I quoted from the Smyth report, where it is said:

> Because of the restrictions of military security there has been no chance for the Congress or the people to debate such questions. They have been seriously considered by all concerned and vigorously debated among the scientists, and the conclusions reached have been passed along to the highest authorities. These questions are not technical questions; they are political and social questions, and the answers given to them may affect all mankind for generations.

Here is our field, the political, moral, and social field. We are not the scientists to understand, nor is it necessary for us to know, the technical details of this new power. But we are the scientists, or should be, in the political field. Here are the problems which we, and we alone, can solve. Let us apply a small fractional part of the intelligence used by the technical men in their discoveries to the problems which are exclusively ours, and the new order can be established. Our world can be constructed on a basis of law and order. Mankind can live in peace. War can be outlawed, and those who come after us will have cause, indeed, to rise up and call this generation blessed.

Mr. President, I have outlined, perhaps, the least of the processes through which we must go in our evolution and growth. They will not all be accomplished at once; no one believes that. But they must come quickly. We must be on our way now, lest all nations perish in the most miserable failure of all generations and of all men.

Paraphrasing, I conclude:

He who lets this generation die
Lets all generations die,
And all generations dying curse him.

He who lets this generation live
Lets all generations live,
And all generations living bless him.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I desire to commend the Senator from New Mexico for a very enlightening, thoughtful, and reasoned treatment of some of our pressing problems.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I wish to join the Senator from Maryland in his expression of appreciation of the speech which we have just heard from the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH]. It was not only a very able but a challenging speech; it was a speech which contributed much to our thinking on the all-important subject of the preservation of peace for our own country and for all the world. It was a speech worthy of the highest and finest traditions of the Senate of the United States.

ALUMINUM PLANT DISPOSAL

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, my remarks are directed to the pressing problems of aluminum plant disposal and the glaring failures of the Government agencies entrusted with this all-important task.

Now that the war is won, these facilities, in the largest measure possible and with the utmost speed, must be converted to peacetime uses.

The people of the United States, who are, today, the owners of this vast wartime industrial plant, have a right to know what goes on behind the murk and confusion of present policy. They have a right to insist that these facilities be used to promote their own well-being and not according to the dictates of selfish and predatory interests.

The Congress set a general framework in the Surplus Property Act of 1944 to guide the disposal of Government-owned plants and other facilities. The act called for the disposal of public property in an orderly and equitable manner. Among its paramount objectives were the purpose to safeguard national security, to foster private enterprise, to discourage monopoly, and to stimulate full employment. The act also instructed the Surplus Property Board—now the Surplus Property Administration—in cooperation with the various disposal agencies, to report to Congress within 3 months after enactment of the law on disposal plans for specified classes of property. Plants costing more than $5,000,000 were included. Aluminum plants and facilities appeared at the head of the list.

More than 6 months after its report was due, the Surplus Property Administration showed no sign of having a program for aluminum plant disposal. A growing concern became manifest among many people, because this policy of government inaction, by resulting in shutdowns and unemployment, acted as an economic strangle-hold upon their communities.

To survey the problems at first hand, the Subcommittee on Aviation and Light Metals of the Senate Committee Investigating the National Defense Program held hearings in the Pacific Northwest, where a considerable share of the aluminum facilities are located. Members of the subcommittee were the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], and myself, as chairman.

The testimony heard by this subcommittee, as well as subsequent evidence before other Senate committees, makes one fact crystal clear to me: Failure of the Government to act plays directly into the hands of a monopoly group that has everything to gain by a do-nothing policy. The attitude of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the disposal agency for aluminum facilities, smacks of outright collusion with this group, or, at the very least, indicates striking incompetence to perform the designated function. I will say more about these matters in a moment, but first I want to discuss briefly the background of events leading up to the present problem.

For 50 years prior to the war, the Aluminum Co. of America, known as Alcoa, was the only producer of primary aluminum in this country. Aluminum is made from a compound called alumina, which in turn is derived from bauxite. It has been said that by destruction of Alcoa's alumina plant before the war, the enemy could have put back our aluminum production and aircraft program for a period of 18 months. This is not the occasion to review Alcoa's role in the early defense program. It is recorded in the hearings and reports of the investigating committee under the distinguished chairmanship of Mr. Truman. It is enough to say that when war came, this country was caught short. Another company, Reynolds, managed to enter the field; also the Government itself, through the Defense Plant Corporation, effected a tremendous expansion of aluminum facilities.

The hungry war machine devoured aluminum at a rate that caused production to be expanded six or seven times. Capacity is now almost 2,500,000,000 pounds annually. The Government's investment in aluminum producing and fabricating facilities aggregates almost $700,000,000, and if we add the corresponding share of public power costs, the investment comes to about $1,000,000,000. Employment in the entire industry rose from 35,000 to a peak of 150,000; and an estimated 2,000,000 workers learned how to process aluminum and magnesium in aircraft and other war plants.

Practically all of the 50 Government aluminum plants were designed, built, and operated by Alcoa. Thus, the present economic and technical problems of disposal are rooted in the decisions of a private corporation which could not successfully deny its interest in the postwar market. During the war the Government, as owner, was the largest single factor in the aluminum business. Alcoa, as operator, produced over 90 percent of the alumina and primary aluminum and large proportions of aluminum products. What the Government does in disposal of its plants now will determine whether the pattern of monopoly control will be continued and consolidated or whether it will be broken to make room for new producers in aluminum.

In the Pacific Northwest are located publicly owned aluminum facilities estimated to cost $200,000,000. More than half the public power produced at Bonneville and Grand Coulee has been devoted to servicing the needs of those plants. Dr. Wilson Compton, president of Washington State College, stated before the subcommittee that decisions with respect to the disposal of these public properties would hasten or retard the development of the Pacific Northwest for 20 years. Among all witnesses, with the exception of spokesmen for Alcoa and the general counsel of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, there was a sense of urgency and a call for prompt and vigorous Government action. Mr. D. K. MacDonald, chairman of the light metals committee, Western States Council, said:

> This is a right-now proposition. These gentlemen who represent labor are interested in having their men go to work, and we fellows in business are interested in seeing these plants operate and other industries come in behind them, so there will be business done.

Henry K. Kaiser, who testified before my subcommittee in San Francisco, warned that—

> We must move, because this whole question of whether this country survives is determined entirely by the speed of its reconversion.

Spokesmen for labor pointed out that many thousands of workers were recruited by the Government and industry on the promise that their jobs in aluminum be permanent. These workers want to stay and keep their homes. Scrapping plants, as Mayor Otto A. Dirkes, of Spokane, said, is scrapping people.

It was unanimously agreed that the Pacific Northwest is capable of building up an integrated aluminum industry. When so developed, the industry, according to Paul J. Raver, head of the Bonneville Power Administration, can employ 25,000 workers, almost four times as many as then employed. Many more workers will get jobs in other industries that consume aluminum if a vast potential market is tapped by new enterprise. On the basis of present estimates, reconversion in the Northwest will have no place for about 90,000 workers unless new industries, big and small, open up. A rounded industrial development is necessary to bring this area into economic balance with other sections, with resultant benefit to the whole Nation.

At Spokane representatives of the Olin Industries, Kaiser Co., Reynolds Metals Co., Columbia Metals Corp., and Alcoa all expressed an interest in acquiring Government plants in the Northwest, and in laying the ground work for an integrated aluminum industry. With the exception of Alcoa, which was the only company offering to purchase outright, these companies wanted, as a first and immediate step, to lease from the Government on terms which would guarantee them an adequate supply of power and raw material, and an interim market until their enterprises were operating on a sound competitive footing. No company was willing to put itself in a position where Alcoa would be both a competitor and the only source of supply for alumina, basic to the production of aluminum. Constructive proposals were put forth for Government action to facilitate the acquisition of plants by private producers other than Alcoa.

Alcoa, for its part, admonished against decisive Government action at this point. It stood to gain by a do-nothing policy, because then the vast Government plant would be scrapped, or Alcoa would get those facilities it desired on its own terms. In this way it would protect its monopoly position in the postwar market—a position of high prices and restricted output. At the same time Alcoa was unwilling to make available to potential competitors data on Government plant operation which they considered necessary for an adequate appraisal of these plants. The glowing tributes and fine lip service that Alcoa paid to competition find no warrant in the long industrial experience of that company.

Alcoa thought it could well afford to sit easy because the leases it held on Government alumina and aluminum-producing plants had two or three more years to run. Early in the defense program, the importance of making lease arrangements which would not further postwar monopoly control nor hamper the Government's freedom of action in disposal was stressed before the Senate Committee Investigating the National Defense Program. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which had a part in these arrangements with Alcoa, and which knew of their terms all along, appeared to have come up with an original discovery—that the Government could make no move to dispose of aluminum plants. There were indications too, that Alcoa was using the lease as a bargaining weapon to secure policies in its favor. When the absurdity of the lease situation, wherein the Government's hands were tied from acting in the public interest, was brought out by the subcommittee in the Spokane hearings, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation scurried around to reexamine its position.

Now the lease with Alcoa contained a provision to the effect that if production in all leased alumina and reduction plants fell below 40 percent of capacity for a 6-month period, either party could cancel on 60 days' notice. By a diligent search of the production figures, the further discovery was made that Alcoa was not maintaining 40 percent of capacity in its reduction and alumina plants, and on August 30 of this year the Reconstruction Finance Corporation gave notice of lease cancellation effective as of October 31. Finally, then, the Government was free to negotiate with other interested parties. The initiative in terminating these restrictive agreements, I assure the Senate, did not come from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation; and the general counsel of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, joining the notice of termination with an offer to discuss the matter further with Alcoa, included this unusual statement:

> In the event we can arrive at a mutually satisfactory basis for adjusting the matter or should you convince us that we are wrong in our present position, we will withdraw the notice of termination.

Now I submit that this is not proper talk for a Government agency that has such a tremendous responsibility to the people of this country. In effect this agency is asking a private corporation to make decisions for it on matters of grave public importance.

A legitimate and understandable concern has been expressed by some Members of the Senate and by other persons, as to the unemployment resulting from the abrupt closing down of the leased facilities. A large measure of responsibility for this distressing state of affairs must be borne by Alcoa because of its die-hard uncompromising pursuit of its own interests. Alcoa refused the offer of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, as alternative to canceling the case, to continue operations for a year, subject to a 60-day notice of termination. But an equally large measure of responsibility must be borne by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which never acted with foresight, and which piled up a heap of difficulties of its own making.

The negative disposal record of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to date indicates beyond a shadow of a doubt that it is not a fit agency to perform this all-important task without a thorough housecleaning and a complete revamping of its fundamental approach. Here are a billion dollars' worth of facilities in aluminum alone, and the trifling contribution of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is to issue a few brochures, send telegrams, or write letters asking who is interested, then sit back and wait for customers. To suppose that a complex portion of the industrial economy can be sold like a piece of surplus equipment is a gross misconception of the job. The very minimum of groundwork requires careful plant by plant studies of productive possibilities, of cost schedules, of prospective markets for products, of the skills in available labor, of the regional economic setting. Consideration must be given to steps necessary to assure prospective buyers of opportunities for stable operation and a reasonable profit. The facts must be presented in an attractive way to possible buyers, and in the case of aluminum particularly, a practical working program must be advanced to get competition into the industry. In the words of a witness before the Spokane hearings of the subcommittee: "The disposal of surplus property, translated into less fancy and more meaningful language, is the ways and means of using the public facilities and the newly created skills of war workers." The Kaiser witness at the subcommittee hearings reported his inability to find a representative of Reconstruction Finance Corporation in the field with sufficient authority to negotiate in the matter of plant disposal. The Surplus Property Administrator's report to Congress itself admits that "the present degree of interest in plant acquisition has arisen slowly in the absence of a campaign of disposal."

A root difficulty brought out by the subcommittee hearings in the Northwest was the jockeying that went on between the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Surplus Property Administration with regard to disposal responsibility. In theory the Surplus Property Administration formulates the policy on disposal and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation carries it out. Between the policy and its execution there is a wide and varying range of problems which each agency is inclined to put off on the other, with a consequent evasion of responsibility by both. In fact, these two agencies are but links in a chain of irresponsibility which they are trying to forge all the way up through the Attorney General's office, the courts, and the Congress.

Had the legal minds in both agencies spent as much time trying to carry out their duties under the law as they have in debating the limits of their respective authorities, this country would be considerably better off today. The Surplus Property Act provides the basis for intelligent and workable disposal policies, and gives a clear mandate to strive for high levels of production and employment. Neither of these agencies has come to Congress and said: To carry out the objectives of the Surplus Property Act, such and such must be done, and—if necessary—we require additional legislation in the following particulars. On the contrary, Mr. Symington, the Surplus Property Administrator, and Mr. Goodloe, General Counsel for Reconstruction Finance Corporation, have constantly advertised the difficulties of the aluminum-disposal problem and have tended to regard the act as exempting them from taking the initiative. Difficulties there are, we must admit, and difficulties there always will be, as long as we live in this uncertain and interesting world. But one axiom we must learn from the long congressional scrutiny of war administration: Difficulties are put in the foreground when it is desired to keep fundamental necessities in the background.

On September 21, 1945, 12 months after enactment of the Surplus Property Act, and 9 months after the due date for its report, the Surplus Property Administration presented to Congress its program for disposal of aluminum plants and facilities. I recommend that Members of both Houses, if they have not already done so, make a serious study of this report. With many, if not all, of its facts and proposals I can agree. But it does not go far enough, and it gives no promise that the Government program will succeed. An admission of defeat is registered even before the work of disposal has begun. Mr. Symington did not specify what was lacking for the successful execution of his responsibilities; instead he prejudged his own failure and handed responsibility up the line by concluding:

> The Board recognizes that conditions beyond its control may make this program impossible of accomplishment. In that event, unless the courts dissolve or reorganize Alcoa under the Sherman Act, it will be for Congress to consider whether to leave the aluminum industry under the domination of one company or whether to authorize the Government either by subsidized or direct operation of key plants to provide some measure of production that is independent of Alcoa's control.

The basic weakness of the aluminum report, which prompted this admission, is that it alters little or nothing as to the hard facts in the case. Mainly it proposes a scale of priorities in disposal, giving preference to competitors of Alcoa and permitting Alcoa to have only those facilities which the Department of Justice will approve as consistent with competition in the industry. This expression of preferences, it is true, reflects the intent of the Surplus Property Act and the mandate of a recent court decision as construed by the Attorney General. But expressing preferences will not of itself dispose of plants. With the 50-year head start that Alcoa has in the aluminum industry, it is no easy matter for competitors to gain a foothold.

The aluminum report of the Surplus Property Administration is dated September 21, 1945. According to the law, the Congress had a 30-day period of review. In view of the importance of

this particular disposal problem, the Congress saw fit to extend the review period another 30 days. That time is up. No further action has been suggested in the Congress. The Surplus Property Administration can now assume its program to have been approved. It can now try to sell or lease facilities as proposed.

The foregoing events, as I have indicated them, make it imperative that a way be sought out of the present impasse.

There are good prospects of getting competitive producers in the aluminum industry if the Government supports an interim market. A sensible and practicable way to do this is by Government stock-piling for national defense. Recommendations that Government purchase of aluminum in a stock-pile program be integrated with plant disposal were made by practically all the industry witnesses, except Alcoa, at the Pacific Northwest hearings of the subcommittee. The Army-Navy Munitions Board has also recommended the stock piling of primary aluminum, and recent hearings have been held on bills to establish stock-piling machinery. Proposed legislation, however, is of a broad, general nature and confers no specific authority upon the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to take necessary action in a way to facilitate aluminum-plant disposal. The aluminum report of the Surplus Property Administration makes no recommendation whatsoever in this regard, except the diffident conclusion that "government policy can also be shaped, if necessary, to enable new producers, along with established old producers, to contribute to that stock pile."

It seems to me that if an aluminum stock pile is acknowledged as vital to national security, and if such purchase by the Government will help get the aluminum plants into operation by private business, there is no reason why the two programs cannot be coordinated. Here is a familiar instance of the Government's left hand not knowing what the right hand is doing. I had supposed, when we set up the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, that here was an agency to take care of this very difficulty and to unify the reconversion program on all fronts. No doubt that Office has reviewed the report on aluminum-plant disposal submitted by Mr. Symington to the Congress. But for all the difference it made, that Office need not have been in existence at all. It stands on the side lines as a more or less interested spectator. Judged by the plain meaning of the law, the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion has failed miserably to do its duty.

I recommend for the prompt consideration of the Congress a simple amendment to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act. This should extend existing authority relating to strategic materials, so that aluminum purchased for stock-pile purposes can be integrated with the disposal of aluminum facilities, consistent with any subsequent stock-pile authority that may be established.

In conclusion I want to say that disposal of aluminum plants presents a yardstick to measure Government performance under the Surplus Property Act. Here is a test of whether the objectives declared in the act will remain empty words or be translated into the living deed. Here is a challenge to the Government in its disposal program, by breaking the grip of monopoly power in the aluminum industry, to set the direction for the whole economy—to substitute for the old order of scarcity and privileged enterprise a new order of expanded production and free independent enterprise.

If it moves wisely and with dispatch, the Government can lay the ground work for a prosperous and productive economy; if it continues to falter and delay, mounting unemployment and distress will be its only accomplishment.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4407) reducing certain appropriations and contract authorizations available for the fiscal year 1946, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, Mr. LUDLOW, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. RABAUT, Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. DIRKSEN, and Mr. ENGEL of Michigan, were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

PROBLEMS OF RETURNING SERVICEMEN

Mr. HART. Mr. President, we have recently passed an amendment to the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, known as the GI bill of rights, making certain improvements in the law, which now stands as a rather generous provision for returning veterans in many important respects, but not in all.

There is being published this week in the Survey Midmonthly, a national journal of social work, a report by Mr. Bradley Buell and Dr. Reginald Robinson. The report is semiofficial at best, but it is important, particularly since it touches upon the needs of returning veterans in certain of those respects which are not covered by the so-called GI bill of rights.

The report is stated to be the result of 5 months of study and field examination of the problems of returning veterans in various communities. Of course, that can be only a sampling. I understand that most of the work in the field has been in the South and West. Three cities of considerable size, and many small ones, were used as focal points. The report covers those factors in the problem of the serviceman which are really community matters and which necessarily present extreme variations as between various sections of the country. Actually, every single man is a different case. Rarely have two men exactly the same problems; and there are very important factors aside from money, provision for education, and so forth, reaching all the way down to the families of the men themselves.

The report by Messrs. Buell and Robinson states, as a result of the survey, that an undue proportion of returned veterans are being confronted by problems of the family, of emotion, economy, and so on, which very adversely affect their readjustment into the life of the community. At one place the report says:

> When the glamour of the moment is gone, when the high excitement of welcome home is over, here will be the residual legatees of a community's failure to organize and equip itself as of today with services which can reduce these difficulties to a minimum. Here, in a practical sense, will be the veterans' problem of tomorrow, evidenced in tragic personal dissatisfaction and a society of disturbing community discontent.

Those are big words, but they mean much, as we study them.

Messrs. Buell and Robinson proceed to say that immediate steps must be taken to provide the services which we owe in that line to the veterans of the Army and Navy. Furthermore, one of the first steps advocated to enable veterans "to land on their own feet in the tradition of American youths" is the establishment of a national service to give communities the leadership which they are now lacking.

Mr. President, in that particular recommendation I am unable to agree at this time. In the Servicemen's Readjustment Act and in the measures being taken by the Veterans' Administration in carrying out that and other laws on the subject, the Federal Government has already set up what I regard as sufficient leadership provision, as the situation now appears. It does remain to follow through down to the local levels, to the families of the veterans, and to their individual cases. That function—and it is a duty—is, to my way of thinking, the province of levels lower than the Federal Government.

The States may well concern themselves with that aspect of the problem, insofar as the States represent the differences in the attendant circumstances, and the leadership which Messrs. Buell and Robinson advocate can be better supplied at the State level; and this should be done.

Mr. President, it happens that such provision was initiated in the State of Connecticut as long as 2½ years ago. It grew out of an organization set up at that time and known as the Connecticut State Reemployment Commission. It was not set up specifically for veterans at all. There has been some publicity as to that commission during the last 2 years, and in it the movement has been variously known as the Connecticut plan, the Bridgeport plan, and the Gray plan. Governor Baldwin originally sponsored the movement. It was entirely unofficial. The Governor found in a Mr. Carl Gray exactly the kind of man who was needed. Mr. Gray is an industrial executive and a busy man, but he is one of the class of very busy men who always contrive to find time to do something more, particularly in the interest of the public good, and for which he never gets paid.

The Connecticut Reemployment Commission is not an operating agency, but it is made up of representatives of many

operating agencies and interested groups in various positions. It is concerned with the coordination of interagency activities and the cooperation of those engaged in such activities, so that each is a supporting factor of the other and by no means a dominant factor in the accomplishment of the plan, except in its own community. In other words, the commission provides a leadership on the State level in the respects where Messrs. Buell and Robinson find that leadership is needed.

Incidentally, that commission was and still is altogether voluntary. It has never consumed any Federal funds whatever, and never has used any of the funds of the State, until the last few months, when a State act made it official and provided something in the way of travel expenses for the men who do the work.

The reemployment commission has never had any hard and fast rule as to how local committees are to be formed, by whom, or whether each is a committee by itself or a subcommittee of another local community organization interested in postwar problems in general. The main objective is to work through some local committee which is deeply conscious of the human engineering aspect of employment and readjustment, and is interested in helping the individual to be a useful member of his community and also of his own family, irrespective of the form of help he may need.

Some of the publicity concerning this organization is the result of observation of the city of Bridgeport, which has been in the forefront of the Connecticut movement. That city does have a small number of full-time men engaged in the program, and last year it set up an annual budget for the purpose. Even so, the voluntary services are most important in Bridgeport, and in the rest of the State almost all of the work is on a volunteer basis.

Out of that movement, which was initiated by Governor Baldwin two and a half years ago, as a part of the Gray plan, there have grown up subsidiary organizations which are known as veterans' reemployment and advisory centers. The particular task of such centers is in relation to the affairs of the veteran. The American Legion was prominent in the original formation of those groups which began sometime back, and other veterans' organizations have joined with them in full seriousness.

Their work constitutes a very considerable portion of what is being done in their communities in the readjustment of veterans. There are now more than 150 local committees in Connecticut which are engaged in this most important work.

It is rather interesting to get a cross section of the matters about which veterans inquire. In 1 day, 941 veterans went to 30 centers, seeking advice, some of them on more than one subject. At that time education was the topic which was most interesting to them, and insurance was next in importance. At another time claims were most important, and at times what are known as counseling and family services are highly important. Very often housing is the most important.

About last August, before any action had been taken by the present Congress on the amendment to the GI bill of rights, I received a letter from one of the veterans' reemployment and advisory committees. The man who wrote it was informing me of his views on the working of the bill as it then stood; and he wrote as follows:

> Many articles have appeared in print recently which have blasted the Veterans' Administration in its entirety. Irrespective of whether such criticism is justified, anyone who says that the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944—the GI bill of rights—was hastily written and rushed through Congress as a political measure is very misinformed or has some ulterior motive. It is a good bill, obviously designed to provide needed assistance to the veteran and, at the same time, protect him from his own inexperience.
>
> From the various changes proposed in the present law some improvement can manifestly result. Some of those amendments are apparently designed to eliminate red tape. As administered by this office in close cooperation with other institutions, there is practically no objectionable red tape. For instance, an enlisted man's application for a loan doesn't see a single Government form until after the proposal has been thoroughly checked. The present bill is basically sound. All it needs is intelligent administration. I am only afraid that enough pressure will be brought from various sources to persuade the Senate that the GI bill of rights should be fundamentally changed.
>
> If there have been any gripes from servicemen on the application of the law to their individual cases, such complaints as reach this office have been very few in number and such as would be expected from a few individuals. If Congress could confine its attention to ironing out some of the administrative difficulties in the Veterans' Administration, particularly as regards hospitals, and encourage the formation of such community organizations as Bridgeport's, it would do much toward eliminating the possibility of another "march on Washington."
>
> Through a fortunate chain of circumstances, Bridgeport has tackled this problem of readjustment in a manner which has been held up as a model for national application.

There has been some publicity to that effect, but that is another matter.

The letter concludes as follows:

> I wish that a Senate committee could visit us and observe the practical application of the present law. It works here.

Mr. President, I have stated what has occurred in my own State merely as an illustration, and in following up what is being proposed by the Survey Midmonthly. The illustration which I have given is in connection with only one phase of the problem—mostly that of economics.

But the human engineering phase is very difficult to write about. It is less tangible, but highly important. It extends into the respective families and into the minds of the individual soldiers themselves. They are all different. No two are alike. They need sympathetic and understanding treatment. Very often the necessity of understanding goes straight to the families. Men who on returning find that their families are unable to understand them, and they cannot understand their families. Right there the trouble starts. I think that the article to which I have referred by Messrs. Buell and Robinson will be well worthy of reading when fully published, and well worthy of the attention broadly over the Nation.

PLANNED INFLATION—ADMINISTRATION'S POLICIES CONTRADICT ITS PROMISES TO PREVENT INFLATION

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, throughout the war we have heard a great deal of the tremendous dangers of inflation. All kinds of control measures have been proposed and adopted by Congress in order to prevent the catastrophe of rapidly rising prices with all the abnormality and hardship which they bring about. We have submitted to radical curbs on the traditional freedom of American housewives and American business. We have closed our eyes to tremendous injustices and oppressions which have daily occurred in the administration of the laws relating to wages and prices and rents. Now, we are suddenly confronted with an administration policy which not only threatens to undo everything that has been done, but ultimately to stimulate an inflation in this country far greater than anyone has conceived of.

Lip service is still paid to the slogan of anti-inflation. Credit is daily claimed for the maintenance of price ceilings, whether these ceilings are effective or not. But two policies contradict these professions; first, the policy of deliberately spending Government money in excess of any reasonable sum which can be raised by taxation and constantly supporting an increase in those expenditures; and, second, the policy of encouraging a general increase in wages. It is utterly hypocritical to talk about maintaining prices while increasing costs, and about Government spending which either increases taxes or inflates purchasing power. In fact, the maintenance of prices under the conditions of rising taxes and costs will only decrease production, and break down that much sooner any legal price structure which it is attempted to maintain.

IMPROVEMENT IN LIVING STANDARDS CANNOT BE PRODUCED BY GOVERNMENT SPENDING, OR BY RAISING ALL WAGES AND SALARIES

If we are going to avoid both inflation and deflation, the economic goal of the Government should be a stable level of wages and prices, and a Government budget substantially balanced. Only thus can we hope, through a steady increase in production and a steady increase in productive ability, to secure a constant improvement. The only possible way to raise standards of living in this country is by increasing production and productive ability. This cannot be done by a policy of boom and depression. It cannot be done by boosting at one fell swoop the whole wage and salary level. If the price level is too high for the wage level, the consumers suffer, buying stops, and depression is produced. On the other hand, if the wage level is too high for the price level, all incentive to produce or expand productive facilities ceases, production and employment drop, and again we face depression. The secret of economic prosperity is a balance between wages and prices, a balance between purchasing power and production, a balance between savings and expenditures for consumption, a balance between farm prices and industrial prices, and a balance between Government expense and taxation. Depressions have occurred in

the past because some factor had gotten completely out of adjustment with the other factors. Thus, in 1929 savings ran far ahead of consumption, and too many people tried to make a fortune and live without working during the remainder of their lives. Furthermore, farm prices and farm purchasing power had fallen below wages and industrial prices from 1926 on. In 1938 wages, taxes, and other costs increased too fast for prices.

The best way to improve the condition of the whole people is to take rapid advantage of increase in productive ability by granting some increase in wages, but even more by bringing about a decrease in prices. If a particular industry like the automobile industry becomes more efficient, most of the benefit ought to be passed on in the price of automobiles. Many workers are in jobs where their production ability cannot be increased and unless the prices of mass-production industries are lowered they do not share at all our increased average standard of living. Comparatively, they are worse off. Not only is it an advantage to a great many more people to decrease prices, but it increases production and thereby increases further the productive ability of the industry and its ability to decrease prices further. A general increase of wages and salaries without any increase in productive ability is pure inflation, and is bound to be reflected in higher prices for all.

WAGES HAVE INCREASED FASTER THAN PRICES

The course of wages and prices is clearly shown by tables in reports of the Bureau of Labor Statistics presented to the Committee on Banking and Currency, which tables I ask to have printed at the close of my remarks.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

(See exhibits A and B.)

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, straight time hourly earnings of factory workers—not take home pay which increased about 70 percent—have increased on the average from 66.4 cents in January 1941 to 93.3 cents in July 1945, an increase of 42 percent. At the same time the cost of living index based on the retail prices of goods purchased by an average lower income family has increased from 100.8 to 129.2, approximately 28 percent or 14 percent less than wage rates. Wholesale prices of all commodities have increased from approximately 80 on January 1, 1941, to 105.9 in July 1945, an increase of 32.4 percent or approximately 10 percent less than wage rates. Wholesale prices of all commodities other than farm products and foods have only increased about 8 percent, while wholesale prices of farm products have increased 72 percent.

There is very little evidence that there has been any increase in the efficiency of labor per man-hour over all industries since 1941. There is a great deal of talk about increased efficiency, but, so far as I can discover, it relates only to a limited number of highly mechanized industries, to those industries to which war brought an abnormal increase in volume, and to the production of war materials where it results from greater knowledge of how to make these materials. The figures show generally that efficiency does not increase in time of war. Of course, there are thousands of jobs in which there is and can be no increase of efficiency per man-hour. I think of waiters in restaurants, elevator operators, and even Senators.

Even before the adoption by the President of his present policy there was some evidence that prices were too low to meet wages and other costs. The policies of the OPA undoubtedly put out of business many small packers and many small operators in other lines. In many industries adequate profits or more than adequate profits have been made, but smaller units in many industries are today operating at a loss. Many products are priced so that a loss is involved in their manufacture. This has resulted in the stoppage of production of standard articles like cheap clothing and standard cotton goods. In short, it looks as if already we had let average wage rates outrun average prices more than can be justified by any increase in efficiency.

Let me say that I do not purport to pass on the justice of prices in particular industries or of wages in particular industries. Undoubtedly, wages are too low in some industries and can be further increased. Prices may be too high on some products. I am speaking merely of the general average throughout the United States which determines over-all economic results. The President is encouraging an over-all increase in all wages and salaries.

WE SHOULD TRY TO STABILIZE WAGE RATES AND PRICES AT APPROXIMATELY PRESENT LEVELS

In short, we now have inflation and inflation which is somewhat out of adjustment. We are faced with the question whether the country would be better off to return to prewar levels or to have prices and wages stabilized approximately where they are. This decision is not entirely in our hands, because the laws of economics and supply and demand operate even in a totalitarian state. Even a complete control of wages and prices in peacetime would not enable us to determine exactly what the wage rate and price level will be, and such a control would utterly destroy freedom and be contrary to the whole basis on which the success of private enterprise must be founded. Nevertheless, Government policies relating to finance, credit, and many other indirect measures can have some effect on the level of wages and prices. To me it has seemed best that we should try to stabilize as far as possible at the present level, where we are. Increases in both wages and prices have been fairly general. We are already committed to the policy of maintaining basic farm prices about where they are for 2 years after the war, even at Government expense. Basic prices of materials like steel and copper have not risen in any substantial percentage, and are not likely to drop now. It looks as if we would have to maintain at least the present prices of lumber and paper if we want to get any supply of these materials at all. It would be very unwise and difficult to reduce wage rates. The sensible policy appears to be one of trying to stabilize at the present levels.

TRUMAN POLICIES WILL FORCE ULTIMATE INFLATION

President Truman has adopted the extraordinary policy of encouraging a general increase in all wages and salaries at the same time that he tries to hold down prices by arbitrary controls. To my mind this is a ridiculous, dangerous, and ultimately impossible policy. It has, however, been frequently advocated by members of the administration. It is clearly the philosophy of Mr. Chester Bowles and the New Deal economists in the Office of Price Administration. It is the policy of Mr. Henry Wallace.

In the President's recent speech, he said:

> Wage increases are therefore imperative—to cushion the shock to our workers, to sustain adequate purchasing power, and to raise the national income.

Later he said:

> Therefore, wherever price increases would have inflationary tendencies—

And they all do, of course—

> we must, above all else, hold the line on prices. Let us hold vigorously to our defense against inflation. Let us continue to hold the price line as we have held it since the spring of 1943.

It may be pointed out from the tables already submitted that since the spring of 1943 average wage rates have gone up 12 percent, while prices have risen only 3 percent. This policy is to be intensified. While the President avoided any direct statement of the percentage of increase which he favors, it was given out to the press that Government economists felt that a 20-percent or even a 24-percent general increase could be made without increasing prices. A 24-percent increase would add 34 points to the present index of 142, making the index 176, or a 76-percent increase since 1941 in straight-time hourly earnings—adjusted for interindustry shifts. A corresponding increase in prices would make at least a 60-percent increase over prewar. This would double the whole increase in cost of living which has taken place during the war.

The administration is also pressing for an increase in the minimum wage from 40 cents an hour to 65 cents an hour, or a 62½ percent increase. Such an increase in the minimum wage reflects itself generally in wages up through the scale.

The President has recently advocated a general increase in the wages of Government workers of at least 20 percent, in addition to the 21 percent which has been recently granted, or a total increase of approximately 45 percent since before the war. I have yet to find anyone who claims that the average efficiency of these workers per man-hour has increased.

The President has further recommended that the higher officials all receive an increase of $10,000 a year, which would be 50 percent in the case of Judges of the Supreme Court, 66⅔ percent in the case of the Cabinet, and 100 percent in the case of other Federal judges, of Representatives and Senators. Perhaps all these officials are more efficient, but I doubt it. Obviously, any such increase would suggest and encourage a similar increase in all salaries throughout the

United States. Certainly increases are justified to keep up with the cost of living, but the President is proposing increases more than double the increase in cost of living.

The general effect of this entire policy would be to raise wages and salaries to a point at least 75 percent above prewar rates. For months we battled about the Little Steel formula, supposed to limit increases to 15 percent. The new policy makes the Little Steel formula look foolish and futile. I think the people ought to know that Congress has not the slightest intention of making any such increases in official salaries as the President has recommended.

Again, Mr. President, I do not say that present wages and salaries are in all cases sufficient. Undoubtedly, there should be substantial increases in some fields and adjustments in others. I believe they should be increased to meet the increase in the cost of living, which only illustrates the fact that if we constantly force prices up, we are going constantly to have to force wages up, resulting in a constant spiral of inflation. But the new policy advocates a general increase nearly twice as great as that which has already occurred. It is about as reckless and irresponsible a policy as any administration has ever proposed.

One can only commend the President for his forthright statement yesterday placing the blame for the traction strike here on those who broke their collective-bargaining agreement. But the attitude of mind which considers a 30-percent increase a matter of right prevailing over all considerations was produced and encouraged by the President's own extraordinary policy of advocating general increases for all. If Representatives and Senators are advised by the President to double their own salaries in the middle of their contract term, why, say the streetcar operators, can we not do the same?

ADMINISTRATION POLICY MEANS HIGHER PRICES

It should be clear to all that the policy means inflation and ultimately will force an increase in price of 65 percent or certainly 60 percent over prewar prices. We cannot lift ourselves by our boot straps. We do not really increase our national income merely by increasing wages, as the President claims. It would be easy to reach Henry Wallace's figure of two hundred billion a year by inflating wages and prices. We could do even better by stamping every $1 to make it a $2 bill. But no one would be any better off. I have pointed out that, considering all activities of men and women workers in all fields, the war has not brought about more than a negligible increase in the productivity of labor. We may reasonably hope that the steady increase of prewar years will be resumed and justify lower prices and some wage increase. But certainly there is nothing now to justify an increase of wage rates to 70 percent over prewar.

Wages and salaries cannot and should not amount to more than 70 percent of national income.

The argument of the CIO and others who think as the President does is that in some way by increasing all wages and salaries, employees can get a bigger share in the national income, and reduce the percentage which goes to other persons who work for themselves, or earn profits in business.

This overlooks the fact that wages are approximately 85 percent of the direct and indirect cost in the manufacturing industries. It furthermore overlooks the fact that the percentage of the national income which goes to wages and salaries tends to remain constant over long periods of time. Since 1933 the percentage of the national income going to wages and salaries has run between 67 and 70 percent, and if the free-enterprise system is to work, wages cannot take much more than 70 percent in the future.

In the years from 1935 to 1940 the national income was divided as follows: To wages and salaries, 68 percent; to return on capital in the form of dividend, interest, and rent, 16 percent; to farmers, 6½ percent; to other business and professional men working for themselves, 9½ percent.

During the war years, 1941 to 1945 inclusive, 70 percent went to wages and salaries, 10 percent to return on capital, 8 percent to the farmers, 3½ percent to others working for themselves, and 3½ percent to corporation savings toward an increase in capital. In the earlier period 1933–40, corporations made no net addition to capital.

Certainly, the farmer ought to get 8 percent of the national income if we are to have a prosperous agriculture; 8½ percent for all others who work for themselves, for the most part small business and professional men, does not seem unreasonable. Ten percent of the national income amounting to approximately $12,500,000,000 is not an unreasonable return on some $250,000,000,000 of property saved and invested to provide jobs and homes and services for 135,000,000 people. It costs on an average $7,500 of capital to provide one additional job. If we want capital saved to provide the jobs we must have, there must be some incentive to save instead of spending. We need at least another $100,000,000,000 of capital invested as soon as possible.

It is quite possible that a few percent might be chiseled off these returns to other people than employees, but the resulting increase in wages and salaries could not be more than 5 percent, say from 70 percent to 75 percent. This could not justify any 70 percent increase over prewar wage rates.

We have heard a good deal in recent months of the terrible increase in corporation profits. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the end of my remarks a table showing the amount of corporation profits from 1929 to 1945.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS of Utah in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit C.)

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the outcry overlooks the fact that corporations actually lost $6,000,000,000 in the years 1931, 1932, and 1933, and that the return of the capital invested was wholly inadequate to stimulate saving or investment through the year 1938. Since that time profits, which include the dividends I have heretofore referred to, have totaled about 6 percent of the national income. If these profits were cut in half, it would only make possible an increase of wages and salaries from 70 percent to 73 percent of national income, which would pay for a wage increase of 4¼ percent over present rates instead of 20 percent or 24 percent over present rates. As a matter of fact, high employment and good wages have always existed at the same time that corporation profits and returns to farmers and others were reasonably liberal. The wage earner was never so badly off as when he got 78 percent of a greatly depleted national income in 1932.

In short, the prosperity of our system depends upon proper balance between wages and salaries, farm income, business profits, and prices. No one gains by trying to grab the other man's share. He simply distorts the picture to a point where depression and unemployment result. In 1929 the property owners tried to grab too large a share, and certainly did not aid themselves or anyone else in the country. Of course, profits can be too great, but if we prevent or regulate monopoly, profits cannot long remain higher than necessary to stimulate investment and therefore employment.

The President is not able to see that price increase is only the result of inflation, not inflation itself or the cause of inflation. It can be brought about by a Government deficit which creates purchasing power without corresponding production. We shall have borrowed $260,000,000,000, and much of the proceeds are of no value to the civilian population. We have created $100,000,000,000 of purchasing power out of thin air. Only a huge production of civilian goods can prevent its ultimately increasing prices.

I do not wish to deal here with the general question of the tremendous expenditures which the President's policy seems to indicate. The armed services alone apparently are going to ask for approximately $9,000,000,000 a year, the new social-security program will cost two or three billion dollars a year, and certainly the budget, if we add up everything the President has recommended, will come very close to $30,000,000,000 a year.

But inflation is bound to result also from an increase in wages, salaries, and other costs. The OPA seems to think it can hold prices down while it permits wages and costs to increase and for a while this might be done, but at a terrible cost. While ultimately higher prices must result, while even now illegal black market operators thrive and flourish, a period of unemployment and depression can be caused like that of 1920. For the result of holding down prices when costs increase is to discourage production, to discourage the enlargement of plants, to discourage thousands of smaller, and larger operators from beginning the enterprises which should produce employment. Mr. Bowles may or may not be right on the automobile industry. A few large manufacturers in any industry may be able to resume their prewar production and operate at a profit. But Mr. Bowles and the

New Dealers must give up their ideas of anything like a "dynamic economy," if they act only with reference to a few large manufacturers.

A shoe manufacturer told me last month that he could double the size of his factory and would like to do so, but that as long as he was losing money on every pair of shoes manufactured, he saw no reason to do more than supply his regular customers. To permit wages to increase and hold prices defeats the very purpose of the policy. It creates an excessive demand and no production. Purchasing power will not produce goods if there are no goods or if no one can make them without losing money. Ultimately price control has to be relaxed or it is swamped in a black market. Then if we have not manufactured a depression by discouraging production, prices must go up to meet the increase of costs.

What we now see is a planned policy of inflation. It means ultimately a tremendously high cost of living, balanced for some by increases in wages and salaries, but not for others. White collar workers, teachers, and State employees cannot get the increase that others may receive. Millions of people have their standard of living reduced. Those who have saved money or widows who receive life insurance find that the proceeds will buy only half what they planned. Charitable institutions find their endowments, in effect, cut in half. The cost of American goods rises to a point at which we can no longer compete in the export market. Inflation creates a boom. Booms are followed by depressions. It is a reckless and irresponsible policy adopted, apparently, merely because the Political Action Committee and the OPA demand it. It is an attractive political policy. Everyone likes to have his wage or salary raised. Everyone likes to get 48 hours' pay for 40 hours' work without working any harder. But getting something for nothing is an illusion.

The CIO planners know better. Their present policy is a political policy, designed to wreck the system of free enterprise if they can do it. It is not designed for the benefit of their own members, who would pay in increased prices the supposed increase in pay.

THE NEW POLICY WAS DEVELOPED BY THE OPA. IT IS UNSOUND, UNJUST, AND HYPOCRITICAL

The policy now announced by the President is only the development of a policy developed by the OPA during the past 2 years, dominated by the thinking of its numerous left-wing economists. About 2 years ago they adopted the policy of establishing an absolute freeze on retail prices regardless of any increase in costs. Except for the black market break-down in the case of various commodities this policy was successfully adhered to, for, from May 1943 until May 1945, straight-time hourly earnings rose 11 percent while the cost of living only rose 2½ percent as shown by the reports of the Bureau of Labor Statistics. In other words, on the average, industry was compelled to absorb more than a 9-percent increase in cost during these 2 years. Many industries were able to do this, particularly when they had a large volume of war business, but others were forced out of business or compelled to do business at a loss. We saw this result in the case of the small packers. We saw it in the disappearance of many textile goods from the market. I have cited many other instances on this floor. The OPA admits that they are compelling many lines of commodities to be sold at a loss and that some industries are compelled by regulation to do business at cost. But the fetish of an absolutely frozen retail level has been maintained in face of the conditions which necessarily forced higher costs.

Recently I was very much surprised to hear that at OPA insistence the RFC has now provided a new subsidy on the price of coffee. It was found that we had to pay Brazil 3 cents a pound more for coffee, and, instead of passing that on to the consumer, which seems to be the only reasonable course—it would cost the average American family about 3 cents every 2 weeks—the OPA is proposing to absorb that by a new subsidy which will cost the American taxpayers during this fiscal year $24,000,000, because OPA is determined that on the books at least, on the record of prices, there shall be no increase in the retail price. On what principle the taxpayer should pay it instead of the consumer I frankly do not understand, and I was the more surprised because as I recall, within the last month, OPA had abandoned the subsidy on butter, which cost a very considerable amount of money.

Today OPA ends the rationing of meat. I do not know whether the rationing of meat ought to be ended, but I know that the trouble with meat has not been due to its rationing. The trouble with meat has been the pricing system which has been pursued all along the line from the producer to the feeder to the packer to the distributor. It seems to me that the situation will be worse if meat rationing is ended, and that the black market condition will increase so long as attempt is made to maintain the very rigid and arbitrary price level which is now maintained.

This policy in the first place is unsound, as I have already pointed out with reference to the extension of it now proposed by the President. By requiring products to be made at a loss it kills production which is the only ultimate method of reducing prices. After fixing a price at which only the largest and most efficient operator can survive, it attempts to adjust for individual manufacturers, allowing some higher prices than others, a policy, of course, which amounts to a fixing of profits rather than prices. Furthermore, as supply increases this relief is of no real assistance to the small concerns, because they cannot compete with the lower prices forced by the OPA on the larger, more efficient concerns. Prices of finished products should be uniform and there should be a margin for the entire industry, based on some prewar margin. This is not a guarantee of profits, because on that margin the efficient concerns will make money and the inefficient concerns will not, just as before the war.

In the second place, the policy of the OPA has been completely unjust to many concerns, especially the smaller companies without representation in Washington. There has been a strong anti-business prejudice, and every businessman is met by the assumption that he is trying to make more than he ought to make. Mr. Bowles in his statement on October 23 before the Banking and Currency Committee denounced businessmen as greedy and as pressure groups.

Injustice is perhaps tolerable in time of war; businesses that fail are casualties of the war; but today the war is over, and we are interested, not in maintaining arbitrary price levels at any cost, but in the promotion of prosperity and employment.

In the third place, the whole attitude of the Price Administration is hypocritical. It pretends that it desires to make adjustments, but it does not intend to do so and seldom does. Applications for increases lie for months in the different sections of the OPA. They are granted by one section and refused by its superior. If one is finally granted it is probably half the increase justified by the evidence and often admitted to be fair by officials in the OPA itself. By that time costs have again increased. One Senator said that OPA has a defense in depth. Certainly it has made it effective.

I do not mean to say that OPA rulings are always wrong, or that the businessmen are always right, but I do say that the general policy of the OPA has been so tight as to squeeze many businesses, discourage production and reconversion and new projects, and cause particular distress to the thousands of small industries which ought to be encouraged.

The Executive order approved by the President on October 30 is a snare and a delusion. It authorizes increases in wages, as if such increases had not been taking place ever since VJ-day. It graciously permits an employer to grant an increase and then apply for an increase in prices which he can be sure he will not get. The Price Administrator cannot take the increase into account until after a test period of 6 months after the increase has been made. By the time the Price Administrator got around to granting an increase, if he ever did, there would be a full year of operation on increased wages and no increase in price. Long before the increase is granted I trust his office will be abolished.

Again, I do not say that in any particular industry, like the automobile industry, wage increases can or cannot be absorbed. I do say that taking the country as a whole, it is absolutely impossible to increase wages without increasing prices, except by forcing men out of business, discouraging those who remain, and decreasing production. The Price Control Act contemplated fair prices for each commodity, and provided that the Price Administrator should take into account general increases in cost of production, distribution and transportation. He has in my opinion refused to follow the spirit of the act and the provisions of the act.

Price control should be based on fair prices for each commodity, based on current costs, and approximately prewar margins over cost.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a joint resolution designed to carry out that general proposal. The joint resolution is similar to the amendment which I offered last year, except that it includes distributors as well as manufacturers.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 120) amending the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 relating to the standards by which maximum prices shall be established, introduced by Mr. TAFT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PRICE CONTROL MUST BE REFORMED OR ABOLISHED

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I believe that price control during the war period was essential. I helped draft and enact the price control law, and supported its extension during the war period. Today, I think most of the control imposed is wholly unnecessary. There are certain scarce commodities where I believe control should be continued, such as sugar and some building materials where the scarcity is so great that there might be a tremendous speculative rise. But as the Price Administration is administered today, I believe we would be better off to abolish it entirely than to continue as it is. It should be reformed and its powers defined.

Price control will be impossible to administer for long when combined with the policy of removing all restrictions from wage increase and encouraging general wage increases, but that period may be just long enough to utterly discourage reconversion and bring about serious depression through increased unemployment.

The OPA is propagandizing wildly for a further renewal of its powers after the first of next July. It caused to be inserted with every allotment check that went out to the dependents of servicemen in October, a card headed "Danger ahead, America," urging that "we must continue to hold the price line until supplies equal demand." Of course, on this principle some control might be indefinitely continued. The other side of the card enjoins every housewife to watch the price line. Refuse to pay a penny over the ceiling price. Be sure you get full weight and the grade for which you are paying. The implication is clear that every retailer is probably a chiseler and trying to short-change the consumer. Over 8,000,000 of these cards were sent to the families of servicemen, probably the most blatant piece of propaganda in which any Government bureau has engaged to perpetuate itself. And yet Mr. Bowles talks about pressure groups. I am beginning to get telegrams from CIO groups saying that prices must be controlled for a long time to come. I have no doubt that the inspiration of those telegrams is from the Office of Price Administration itself.

It is easy to work up an unthinking support for a general control of prices, among people who do not realize that price fixing can only end in the socialization of industry and dictation to the individual. So also it is easy to work up unthinking support for a Government prohibition of strikes. But people do not seem to realize that a general prohibition of strikes, or compulsory arbitration, means the fixing of wages by law and by force. If strikes are forbidden, except in certain temporary cases as during the life of a collective bargaining agreement or pending a conference, the Government must assume the responsibility of fixing wage rates, first in one industry, and then in all.

In my opinion a general policy of fixing wages and prices means the end of freedom of enterprise in any country. It subjects to Government control hundreds of millions of transactions every day in the year. It regiments every activity of businessman, housewife, employer, and employee. It must be abandoned at the earliest possible moment.

Now that peace has come, the Government should not assume to state any general policy of wage increase or decrease. It should leave that to collective bargaining in each industry, and it should adjust such prices as are to be controlled for a few months more, to the increased costs which actually exist.

We are met and will be met by the argument that economic emergency at home is exactly like the emergency created by war. The argument is a fallacy. Controls are necessary in war. We must give up many of our freedoms. No such necessity exists in peacetime to surrender the freedom for which the war was fought. The maintenance of freedom is essential to the kind of prosperity and standard of living we wish to attain. Prices should be controlled by the prevention of monopolistic practices. If competition is maintained they will adjust themselves to the place where they should be. In cases of great maladjustment or abuse, Government can occasionally step in as perhaps in the maintenance of farm prices.

CONCLUSION—DEPRESSION, THEN INFLATION

In conclusion, Mr. President, the Government today is pursuing two diametrically opposed policies, one to support a general increase in salaries and wage rates, and the other to keep retail prices frozen. This policy in the immediate future threatens reconversion and reemployment to such an extent that it may actually throw our economy into a tail spin. The Government itself is already predicting a total unemployment load of 8,000,000 which I believe to be wholly unnecessary if we can return to common sense in economic policy. If the policy is combined with general strikes which further check production, we may repeat our experience of 1920.

But ultimately the general policy of increasing salaries and wage rates is bound to produce a serious inflation and raise the whole level of prices in this country to a point which will produce hardship on many, speculative profits for a few, a boom like 1929, then again a major depression such as that in 1932.

EXHIBIT A

Average earnings of factory workers compared with cost-of-living changes

[Bureau of Labor Statistics]

	Gross weekly earnings	Gross hourly earnings	Straight-time hourly earnings— Based on current employee-hours	Straight-time hourly earnings— Adjusted for inter-industry shifts (hours as of January 1941)	Cost of living index, 1935–39=100
1939 (average)	$23.86	$0.633	$0.622	$0.640	99.4
1940 (average)	25.20	.661	.648	.654	100.2
1941 (average)	29.58	.729	.702	.700	105.2
January	26.64	.683	.664	.654	100.8
February	27.47	.685	.664	.663	100.8
March	27.90	.689	.665	.665	101.2
April	28.08	.702	.679	.677	102.2
May	29.34	.721	.694	.689	102.9
June	30.23	.732	.701	.698	104.6
July	29.62	.735	.708	.710	105.3
August	30.25	.736	.707	.710	106.2
September	30.67	.748	.719	.719	108.1
October	31.35	.761	.730	.727	109.3
November	31.23	.773	.745	.739	110.2
December	32.18	.783	.750	.744	110.5
1942 (average)	36.65	.853	.805	.781	116.5
January	33.40	.801	.762	.751	112.0
February	34.05	.803	.761	.751	112.9
March	34.63	.811	.767	.755	114.3
April	35.10	.822	.777	.762	115.1
May	35.82	.835	.788	.771	116.0
June	36.25	.845	.797	.775	116.4
July	36.43	.856	.809	.783	117.0
August	37.38	.870	.820	.790	117.5
September	37.80	.892	.844	.811	117.8
October	38.89	.893	.839	.807	119.0
November	39.78	.905	.848	.810	119.8
December	40.27	.907	.847	.809	120.4
1943 (average)	43.14	.961	.894	.846	123.6
January	40.62	.919	.859	.819	120.7
February	41.12	.924	.863	.820	121.0
March	41.75	.934	.870	.827	122.8
April	42.48	.944	.878	.833	124.1
May	43.08	.953	.885	.840	125.1
June	43.25	.959	.891	.843	124.8
July	42.76	.963	.899	.850	123.9
August	43.52	.965	.897	.848	123.4
September	44.39	.993	.925	.871	123.9
October	44.86	.988	.916	.863	124.4
November	45.32	.996	.923	.867	124.2
December	44.68	.995	.927	.873	124.4
1944 (average)	46.08	1.019	.947	.896	125.5
January	45.29	1.002	.931	.877	124.2
February	45.47	1.003	.931	.878	123.8
March	45.64	1.006	.934	.881	123.8
April	45.55	1.013	.942	.889	124.6
May	46.02	1.017	.944	.892	125.1
June	46.24	1.017	.944	.894	125.4
July	45.43	1.018	.950	.901	126.1
August	45.88	1.016	.945	.897	126.4
September	46.24	1.032	.962	.914	126.5
October	46.94	1.031	.956	.908	126.5
November	46.85	1.035	.961	.909	126.6
December	47.45	1.040	.963	.912	127.0
1945:					
January	47.50	1.046	.970	.920	127.1
February	47.37	1.043	.968	.918	126.9
March	47.40	1.044	.969	.922	126.8
April	47.12	1.044	.971	.925	127.1
May	46.03	1.043	.977	.934	128.1
June	46.32	1.038	-------	.931	129.0
July	45.45	1.033	-------	.933	129.4

EXHIBIT B

Table showing the percentage of national income paid out to various types of recipients from 1929 to 1945

[Department of Commerce Statistical Abstract]

	Wages and salaries	Farmers	Other individual business and professional men	Return on capital including interest, rent, and dividends
1929	63.7	6.2	10.2	18.4
1930	70.0	5.5	9.4	21.2
1931	74.0	4.4	8.9	22.9
1932	78.0	3.7	8.4	24.5
1933	70.0	5.3	10.0	20.7
1934	69.0	5.4	9.8	19.0
1935	67.0	7.3	9.5	18.0
1936	66.0	6.8	10.0	18.3
1937	67.5	7.0	9.5	17.0

Table showing the percentage of national income paid out to various types of recipients from 1929 to 1945—Continued.

[Department of Commerce Statistical Abstract]

	Wages and salaries	Farmers	Other individual business and professional men	Return on capital including interest, rent, and dividends
1938	70.0	6.2	9.5	16.3
1939	68.0	6.0	9.7	15.6
1940	67.0	5.6	10.0	14.7
1941	67.0	6.5	9.7	12.8
1942	70.0	8.1	8.6	10.3
1943	70.0	7.9	7.7	9.3
1944	72.0	7.4	7.7	9.3
1945	70.5	8.0	8.1	10.3

EXHIBIT C

Table showing net corporation profits after taxes, and the percentage of national income represented thereby from 1929 to 1945

[Department of Commerce Statistical Abstract]

	National income	Corporation profits	Percentage
1929	$83,326,000,000	$7,194,000,000	8.6
1930	68,858,000,000	1,723,000,000	2.6
1931	54,479,000,000	−1,614,000,000	−3.0
1932	39,963,000,000	−3,646,000,000	−9.1
1933	42,322,000,000	−625,000,000	−1.5
1934	49,455,000,000	549,000,000	1.1
1935	55,719,000,000	1,668,000,000	2.9
1936	64,924,000,000	3,767,000,000	5.8
1937	71,513,000,000	3,943,000,000	5.5
1938	64,200,000,000	1,658,000,000	2.5
1939	70,829,000,000	4,228,000,000	6.0
1940	77,809,000,000	5,844,000,000	7.5
1941	95,618,000,000	7,668,000,000	8.0
1942	119,791,000,000	7,600,000,000	6.3
1943	149,400,000,000	9,800,000,000	6.5
1944	160,700,000,000	9,900,000,000	6.2
1945	157,000,000,000	9,300,000,000	5.9

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TAFT. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GUFFEY. When were the salaries of Members of Congress increased from $7,500 to $10,000?

Mr. TAFT. I do not know.

Mr. GUFFEY. More than 20 years ago, on March 4, 1925. Does the Senator know the wages paid to streetcar conductors and motormen at that time?

Mr. TAFT. No; I could not tell the Senator.

Mr. GUFFEY. An increase in the salaries of Government officials is proposed. The Senator says that Members of Congress have no right to have their salaries increased. Do not Members of Congress have some rights, after waiting 20 years?

Mr. TAFT. I am suggesting that any increase in congressional salaries should be in accordance with the increase in the cost of living, and that salaries should not be doubled. I shall be glad to vote for an increase in salaries of Members of Congress which would represent the increase in the cost of living, which has increased about 30 percent since 1929. That does not justify a 100-percent increase, which is what I am opposing.

Incidentally, today practically every streetcar operator does the work which two men did in 1925.

Mr. GUFFEY. He does not work any longer hours.

Mr. TAFT. Street-railway labor has nearly doubled.

Mr. GUFFEY. The streetcar operator does not work any longer hours. Platform expenses are lower now than they were 20 years ago. The streetcar operator is no more efficient now than he was at that time.

COST-ABSORPTION POLICY OF OPA

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, on Thursday, November 15, on behalf of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] and myself, I introduced a joint resolution asking for relief from the policy of the Office of Price Administration relating to the absorption of costs by various segments of an industry. After an increase has been granted for any reason to the manufacturer or producer, instead of the price ceiling being raised on the particular product involved, various segments of the industry which handle the product are called upon to absorb the increased costs. At that time I discussed the automobile pricing program. I also discussed the wholesale lumber discounts, with which every Senator should acquaint himself, because they affect the distribution of lumber to the retail yards.

I hold in my hand an Associated Press dispatch from Washington, reading as follows:

OPA MOVES TO HIKE UNDERWEAR SUPPLY

WASHINGTON.—The OPA on Wednesday acted to provide more heavy underwear in time for the winter season.

It authorized manufacturers to apply for price increases to assure a profit, but said prices to the public will not be increased. Distributors' profit margins will be narrowed.

This dispatch applies to the manufacturers of underclothing. Without any doubt, the policies of the Office of Price Administration which are now being promulgated are expected to apply to all industry.

The question I raised then and the one I raise now is whether OPA have a right to regulate the profits of a business. It is my theory—and I thought I showed it very clearly before—that the Price Control Act applies only to the regulation of prices. Here again the OPA is extending into the clothing industry the same formula which has been applied to the lumber industry, the automobile industry, and a dozen others. In each case the Office of Price Administration is attempting to regulate profits. It says to the distributors of clothing that after the producers and the textile mills have been granted an increase—in this particular case it was an increase in wages—somewhere along the line the distributors must absorb the additional costs. That is what is holding up so many of our businesses and is causing trouble with reconversion. I have statistics to prove that it is having its impact on the retailers and distributors of the country.

Let me read an Associated Press dispatch from Philadelphia:

RATE OF BUSINESS MORTALITY STAGGERING

PHILADELPHIA, PA., November 13.—The rate of business mortality in the United States reached "the staggering total of approximately one dead out of every three born" during the first quarter of this year, Alfred Schindler, Under Secretary of Commerce, said today.

Schindler asserted in an address that "approximately 550 small businesses have been casualties by the wayside each day of the year."

While 50,000 businesses closed during the first 3 months of the year, Schindler said, only 130,000 new business ventures were opened.

If we inquire of those businesses what their trouble has been, we find, as I said last Thursday, that the difficulty has been unnecessary regulations; it has been the price policies adopted by the OPA which have taken out of the distributors' pockets the increased costs which have been allowed somewhere along the line to other segments of the industry. I tell the Senate that the joint resolution introduced by the Small Business Committee was presented in all seriousness. There should be no politics about it. It has been referred to a committee, but as yet we have received no notice of hearings on the resolution. I am on my feet today to call the attention of the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, to which the joint resolution has been referred, to the fact that we expect to have hearings on it at some time in the near future.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The matter was discussed at the last meeting of the Banking and Currency Committee. The general conclusion of the committee was that it would prefer to consider measures designed to correct the evils in the Price Administration, rather than to go into an investigation of its past history. I think it was at least implied that immediately after the first of the year such measures would be given serious consideration, but that we would be taking two bites at the matter if first we investigated and then we considered measures on the subject. The Senator has a joint resolution relating to it, and I have just introduced a joint resolution on the same subject. I hope there may be other measures for the purpose of correcting the conditions to which we are referring. I assure the Senator that I shall do everything within my power to force the beginning of hearings on those measures as soon as Congress returns in January.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator from Ohio for his observation enlightening the Senate regarding what can be expected from the Banking and Currency Committee early in January.

Let me say concerning the resolutions to which the distinguished Senator from Ohio has referred that at least one of them—the one introduced by the distinguished Senator from Oregon—called for an over-all investigation. Of course, I am in favor of that. In fact, if I remember correctly, I believe I joined the distinguished Senator from Oregon in the introduction of either that resolution or a similar one.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to state for the record that during the next morning hour I shall move to discharge the Committee on Banking and Currency from further consideration of Senate Resolu-

tion 156, because I am not interested in waiting until January for action which should have been taken at least 4 months ago.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon, and I shall support his motion.

Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the joint resolution to which I have referred is not for the purpose of investigating the OPA. I am in favor of having the OPA investigated, but I should like to have the resolution brought before the Senate immediately. I refer to the measure which has to do with prohibiting the Office of Price Administration from permitting an increase in cost to any particular group anywhere along the line and then compelling a wholesaler or retailer or some other segment of the industry to absorb that cost without increasing the price. If that course is continued, then the present administration and the Congress will have squarely given authority to the Price Administration to regulate the profits of every business in the United States. Such authority is not granted by the Price Control Act. I think the measure to which I have referred should immediately come to the floor of the Senate, and I think there should be no politics about it at all. This is a question of preserving our American economy. It is a question of preserving businesses which have been in existence for many years. Their life blood, which is their profit, is being taken away from them, and in many instances they have had to close their doors. How in the world, Mr. President, can we encourage a veteran to establish himself in a business in view of all the uncertainty with which he is confronted now relative to prices and price regulations? It is simply impossible.

I ask the Members of the Senate please to study the joint resolution to which I have referred, and I hope the Banking and Currency Committee will not delay action on it further.

The corrective legislation to which the distinguished Senator from Ohio has already referred—the joint resolution he has introduced today—falls into a different category, it seems to me, from that of the measure calling for an overall investigation. I have not seen the Senator's resolution. If it includes the same provisions as those which were included in the one introduced on behalf of the Senate Small Business Committee, all well and good; we can consider them together. But the relief we seek is the placing on the Office of Price Administration a prohibition against continuing to take from wholesalers or retailers or distributors the profits to which they are entitled under the sacred right of contract, merely in order to take care of an increased cost granted by the OPA further down the line. Such procedure is what has been disrupting our commerce, and it is the reason for the statement that the casualties of small businesses have been 550 a day throughout this year. The number will increase and we shall have greater difficulty in stabilizing our economy unless we correct the so-called cost-absorption policy which is being used by the planners in the bureaus in Washington to put over a program of increasing wages without increasing ceiling prices. We might just as well face that issue and decide what we shall do about it, and then not allow businesses to be molested in connection with a right, which they have under private contracts, to receive profits to which they are entitled and which they must have if they are to continue to exist.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter which I have received from Mr. Louis Kavan, secretary of the Federation of Nebraska Retailers. His letter has to do with the action taken by the OPA in connection with shortages in sugar inventories in the case of certain grocers.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERATION OF NEBRASKA RETAILERS,
Omaha, Nebr., November 20, 1945.

Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Immediate and drastic action is necessary if we are to avoid a wholesale prosecution of honest retail grocers throughout this area.

Several grocers received summons to appear before the OPA hearing commissioner this coming week, on account of being short in their sugar inventories. Some of these grocers are only short a few pounds and when you stop to consider that we have had sugar rationing for almost 4 years, some allowance should be made due to pilferage, misplaced or lost sugar stamps and various other reasons.

I have been informed by the local legal department that no tolerance is allowed under the law and any retailer whose sugar stock is not up to what he should have will be served a summons and will have to appear before the hearing committee. There isn't a single retail grocer in the United States who could possibly account for every pound of sugar originally allowed under the law.

It is about time to stop some of this damned foolishness, making criminals out of honest legitimate businessmen. You have no idea of the mental agony this sugar deal is causing. There are bootleggers now offering sugar stamps for sale, I understand, at $8 per hundred. You can appreciate the position a retailer can place himself into if on one side he is being prosecuted for being a few pounds of sugar short, and on the other side some racketeer is offering him a means of getting himself out of difficulty.

It certainly looks as though the OPA is using their legal department to drum up as many cases as they can so at some future date when they are seeking an extension of the act and increased appropriations they can use the number of cases instituted as reason for extension and more money. As a champion of the small retailers, I know that we can depend upon you to fight this damnable condition to a finish.

For your information chain food stores are not responsible as individual stores as far as allowable inventories are concerned. The headquarters office of the chain takes care of all of the ration program. In this way the chain store avoids getting into trouble with OPA. This whole OPA program seems to be working toward centralized control, as well as the centralization of big business.

Yours very truly,

LOUIS KAVAN,
Secretary.

INADEQUACY OF AID TO VETERANS

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter which comes from a man who has just recently been honorably discharged from the service of his country. He was an officer in the service, and formerly was a practicing dentist in Nebraska. I should like to have the Members of the Senate know about the difficulty which a man in his position is having in obtaining material which has been declared surplus by the Army. When the men are being discharged, they are given the impression that they can use their certificates of discharge in getting almost anything in the world they want, but it does not work out that way. The letter which I submit will illustrate the facts of the situation.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOVEMBER 16, 1945.

DEAR SENATOR BUTLER: As I well know, the majority of letters reaching your office consist primarily of complaints and criticism and I will admit now that this letter will be no exception. I will contend, though, that what I have to say is true, not only in my own individual case, but also for thousands of veterans that are trying through the various Government agencies to reestablish themselves in their respective fields of endeavor, and it is with their welfare in mind I relate my own experience, for I feel that I have my profession and can become established some way, but they are literally and figuratively stuck.

When I was first separated from the service I was informed that all I needed to do was present my certification of discharge to any of the number of agencies dealing in surplus property and I would be able to obtain the necessary dental equipment to furnish my office.

At my home, Alliance, Nebr., I contacted the representative of the Veterans' Administration and was told to go to the Lincoln, Nebr., office and I would be taken care of on the matter. In Lincoln I was then sent to the Omaha office of the Smaller War Plants Corporation. There I was interviewed and requested to fill out long and no doubt necessary applications, which listed in detail every item needed for my use. After a 10-day wait the applications were returned to me properly filled out, certified, and verified, with an authorization to call on the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in Omaha and tell them my needs. This I did, only to be sent in turn to St. Louis, Mo., and Kansas City. At every office the answer was the same, nothing available and no information as to when such equipment would be declared as surplus.

Back again in Lincoln I tried all of the commercial dental supply houses only to learn that such equipment is not being manufactured and they could not promise delivery in anything less than 6 months. At this time I contacted my former employer, Mr. Livingston, and he explained my plight to you.

After receiving your telegram instructing me to see Mr. John DeMun in the Kansas City office of the RFC, I notified him by wire of my arrival, then proceeded to his office. I was treated nicely there, that I will admit, but the equipment situation is still far from settled.

Mr. DeMun's office informed me they had absolutely nothing in the way of dental or medical equipment; and if they were to obtain it that day, it would be at least 3 months before their bookkeeping system could be organized to handle it. Their only explanation was that the services had not yet declared

any such material as surplus, and until the office of the Surgeon General of the Army did so they had no authority in the matter, as well as no equipment.

I do appreciate, sir, everything you have done to help me on this matter, but I now have the feeling it is a useless task. I do have fears for those men unable to find employment and that intended to go into business for themselves, for they are due for considerable disappointment when they hit the snags of these various agencies.

As for the dental and medical profession, we are definitely tied down being unable to obtain the very necessary equipment, but the irony of it all is that the Midwest is complaining of a shortage of doctors and dentists.

I want to thank you again, Senator BUTLER, for the interest you have shown in my case.

Very sincerely.

STATE PLAN FOR WATER USE IN NEBRASKA

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an address which was delivered at Kearny, Nebr., at a meeting of the Nebraska Reclamation Association, by Hon. C. Petrus, a member of the Nebraska Unicameral, and chairman of the water committee of the legislative council. The address was on the subject of a State plan for water use in Nebraska.

Nebraska has nearly 1,000,000 acres which are irrigable, and we in Nebraska are keenly interested in a water-development program. I am sure the address will be of interest to the Members of the Senate.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A STATE PLAN

When the pioneers of Nebraska set up their homes it was their belief that full development would be reached when the sod had been turned under and the land put into cultivation. From then on the task would consist of tilling the soil.

Our history as a State is so brief that on the clock of the ages it scarcely represents a single swing of the pendulum. Yet those of us who have lived the greater portion of that period are fully conscious of fundamental changes already in the making and other violent changes indicated as a part of the near future.

These changes are in many fields. The soil which seemed to the pioneers inexhaustible in its fertility has been found to be limited both in its intrinsic content and by deterioration by erosion.

Our capacity to consistently produce crops is impaired by recurring cycles of deficient rainfall.

We find ourselves in a changing economy where inadequately organized agriculture is caught in the squeeze of other highly organized economic groups.

Government, which during pioneer days was essentially local, has been rapidly centralizing, first into State activity and then Federal control.

Our Nation has two systems operating simultaneously in the same space—a political system in which decisions are arrived at by counting persons and an economic system in which decisions are arrived at by counting dollars. In the political system each of us has an equal voice. In the economic system our voice is determined by how many dollars we can vote.

It is not strange that these two systems develop friction. The important question is how conflicts are resolved. When decisions are made in the economic system which a majority of the people do not like, resort is had to the political system to overrule the economic decisions.

Much of our present turmoil arises from the interference with economic decisions by political agencies. As we observe the process, however, we soon sense that it is not always that the political system functions in response to majority decisions. Rather the political system responds to pressures from minority groups or blocks, formed to sponsor the demands of specific interests.

Among such groups or blocks are organized labor, organized agriculture, chambers of commerce, organized old-age groups, organized school teachers, organized highway users, organized manufacturers, and hundreds of other groups.

It is no answer to assert that these groups ought not to exist. Organized labor is an inevitable outgrowth of centralized economic power. The individual laborer has no such bargaining power as to enable him to deal at arms length with single employers of tens of thousands. Organized industry has for many decades successfully enlisted governmental support for programs which have brought benefits to industry with little if any benefit to agriculture. This being so, the farm bloc came into existence to obtain governmental support for programs designed to aid agriculture.

Chambers of commerce, that organized group which speaks, in the main, for agencies of distribution, has been vociferous in its demands for the support of business, otherwise euphoneously referred to as "private enterprise."

Under our form of Government it is entirely proper for all of these agencies to exist and to speak for their respective constituencies.

These groups are all firm believers in democracy in the political sense of equal power to all citizens at the ballot box in the selection of public officials chosen to serve in governmental positions. But when these public servants have been chosen, these various groups each make their demands for benefits. We shall ultimately face the question of whether our economic system of private property can endure if these various demands are all met.

The problem which these factors present is to find means of evaluating, in terms of the general public interest, the various programs, of coordinating the various programs into sound policy and then, by sound argument, seek to support the coordinated plan in the interest of the general welfare of all people.

Democracy, that combination of philosophy, economic functions and governmental procedure, which seeks the liberation of the individual and the maintenance of the individual as a free agent, has successfully met the challenge of war. It remains to be yet determined whether democracy can successfully meet the challenge of forces of disorganization. There is a very real need for processes of integration. This is true not only in the national sphere. It is equally true in State matters.

The greatest tribute we can pay to General Eisenhower is that he succeeded in obtaining teamwork among the Allies. This was not always made possible by the willing acceptance of all—it was possible because the choice was between agreement and teamwork on the one hand and disunity and defeat on the other.

We in Nebraska are in need of teamwork. We need to change from quarreling camps to effective allies in order to achieve our common objectives. This does not mean that we need to end the work involved in sponsoring specific projects in which we have a special interest. It does mean that we all recognize that all specific developments require the support of an over-all program without which all fail. The question is, how can such a unified development be accomplished.

We can state an objective which meets with unqualified approval, namely, we all desire the fullest use of all of our natural resources. When we attempt to describe methods for the achievement of this universal objective we soon find ourselves in disagreement. Nor is this strange. We are not alone in this matter of differences of opinion resulting from looking at a common problem from different points of view. Neither need we assume that these differences necessarily stem from unworthy and selfish motives.

Persons as far removed from immediate personal interests as the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation found themselves in conflict with reference to future plans in our area. When the Army engineers looked at the problem of Missouri Basin development from the standpoint of flood control and navigation and the Bureau of Reclamation looked at the problem from the standpoint of irrigation and soil conservation, their respective plans failed to coincide. It was necessary for Congress to lay down some guiding principles, one of which was that water originating in the semiarid West was, in the public interest, charged with a first function of beneficial use superior to navigation. In other words, irrigation is superior to navigation. With this principle established the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation were able to coordinate their plans into a unified program.

The first task in seeking a solution to a problem is to seek agreement as to a definition of the problem itself. The next step is to separate the problam into its component parts.

We have already stated the problem: How shall we obtain the fullest use of all of our natural resources?

The problem separates itself into a rather substantial list of component parts. Among them are (1) conservation of soil, (2) the highest beneficial use of water, principally irrigation, (3) flood control, (4) development and distribution of cheap electric energy, (5) navigation, (6) sanitation, (7) conservation of wild life, (8) development of recreational facilities, (9) development of a combined and balanced raw material and industrial economy.

There is now before us a plan for the development of the Missouri Valley in which we are all vitally interested, known as the Pick-Sloan plan. While the development outlined in this plan does not specifically include all of the items which we have enumerated in our list of factors, it does include many directly and others indirectly.

We need to undertake a frank and critical examination of this plan with its basin-wide approach.

If we can for a moment forget the current debates about who shall be in charge and think about the plans themselves we may be able to arrive at some conclusions that can help us to chart a course. For myself I am willing to confess that the debates about MVA have been of small value. At times I have been tempted to believe that much of the oratory has been designed to confuse rather than to enlighten. I have heard very little about plans of construction. Most of the discussion has been what President Roosevelt used to refer to as "iffy." If Congress appropriates the money and if the structures are built who shall function as management, and with what authority? I do not mean to suggest that the question is unimportant, but it can have no substance unless funds are made available and structures built.

Lying between the Rocky Mountains and a line north and south from Canada to the Gulf through the eastern portion of our State are millions of acres of fertile land. Nature in this area has developed immense drainage areas, which discharge water through the Missouri River and the Mississippi. Here live about 7,000,000 of human beings whose eco-

nomic welfare depends on the use of the water which nature supplies. This is one-sixth of the land area of the United States.

The individual is unable to harness these resources. The task is too large for a neighborhood of individuals, or counties, or local districts. The solution requires the enlistment of the economic power of the entire Nation.

Fortunately, the Nation is interested. Plans have been formulated by the expenditure of substantial sums of Federal funds. Approval has been given by Congress, and some of the work appears ready to be undertaken in the very near future. The plan is to irrigate about 5,000,000 acres more, of which about 1,000,000 acres is in our State. All of our State is within the Missouri Basin.

How well does our planning as a State fit into these national plans, and what, if anything, remains for us to do either to modify our plans or to seek modification of the national plans?

I think it can be said with the fullest confidence that nothing will be done in our State contrary to the laws of our State. This is so, not because power does not exist in the Federal Government to override State decisions, but because it is the established policy of Federal agencies to wait until the State deems the proposed development desirable and adjusts its laws so as to make that development possible in full conformity with State laws.

We can perhaps illustrate this point with the practise of our own State agencies in the matter of State highways. Where local controversies raged as to routes or kind of construction, the State agencies left the community and worked in other areas, until the contending groups composed their quarrels in order to ge out of the mud.

We may anticipate like action by the Federal agencies. If we are more interested in our own controversies than we are in progress, we shall in all probability have all the time we want to continue our quarrels while work is in progress elsewhere.

What is the general outline of these Federal plans? The rivers which drain the area east of the Rocky Mountains take strange courses. The Missouri and the Mississippi both start a journey northward while their destination is the Gulf of Mexico. After abandoning the course to the north the Missour travels eastward until it finally starts going south. These detours have resulted in bringing the main stem of the river system east of the area which needs the water most.

In our own State the Niobrara describes a similar pattern. The Loup River system starts generally in a southeasterly direction as though it intended to follow the general slope of the State from northwest to southeast. If this course had continued the Loup River waters would have reached the Platte in areas where water is in great demand. But for some reason nture started this water to the north and east and kept it out of the Platte River for some 200 miles.

The Platte flows along the hillside of our sloping plain with no tributaries from the south and with very little surface drainage from the north.

The broad outline of the Federal plans gives recognition to these factors and if carried into effect will provide for interceptions and rerouting of some of the water across the intervening elevations in order to use more water for irrigation in the area west of the main stem of the Missouri.

This diagonal rerouting of surplus water will not become a reality in our State unless the laws of the State are so modified as to make it consistent with our legislative policy.

It will therefore become important for us to attempt to evaluate the Federal plans in terms of the general welfare of the State.

Engineering studies are still in process and perhaps it is too early to attempt final conclusions. We can, however, make some approach even before final studies are complete.

Four major developments are within the possibilities in the near future. These are:

1. The Republican Valley development.
2. Completion of the tricounty project.
3. The mid-State development.
4. The Loup River projects.

I mention these four, not with the thought that these are the only projects in contemplation but because they hold the key to other developments.

The Republican Valley development is largely self-contained and seems fully realizable within the present legislative policy of the State. There is much planning yet to do before the completed program will be before us but there is a minimum of conflict between that development and the other three which we have mentioned.

The keen rivalry between tricounty and mid-State is well known. It is also very understandable. The decision of the State supreme court 9 years ago construing existing statutes limiting the use of Platte River water to the Platte River watershed cut off about half of the land which the tricounty plans, as originally developed, had included. The decision did not, however, restore the appropriated water to the Platte River Valley, (using the word "valley" as meaning the valley proper as distinguished from the watershed).

It is small comfort to the people in the mid-State area to know that the Platte River water may not be used on the Republican side of the watershed, if it will still go out of the valley and be used on the upland. Their primary concern is (or should be) how much water goes out of the valley, not where outside of the valley it is used.

Any impartial student of the situation must recognize that the State is vitally interested in the mid-State development. Everyone familiar with the situation must sense that the State at large should bend every effort to provide for that area a dependable and adequate water supply.

Nor is that problem limited to a supply for gravity irrigation. A depletion of the subsurface waters in the region which in a state of nature had a water level which afforded subirrigation must give concern to the State, both from a sense of fundamental equities and from the point of view of the economic welfare of the State.

The question is whether these conflicting interests can be accommodated and both be more fully served.

In my judgment they will neither be fully served if we confine the water supply to that which flows in the Platte River alone.

The Platte River system will receive something like 320,000 acre-feet annually by means of transmountain diversion, that is to say, water which in a state of nature would go down to the Pacific on the west side of the Continental Divide. It is not probable that much of this water will reach Nebraska. It will be used and reused both for gravity irrigation and pump irrigation west of our State boundary. However, we are still counting on surplus water from the South Platte for the effective use of the Sutherland Reservoir. The existence of the added supply from the west side of the mountains gives greater assurance that such surplus water will become available and thereby serve the Platte valley this side of North Platte.

The Kingsley Dam has brought and will continue to bring very substantial benefits to the lands in the Platte River valley.

But when all of this has been said much unsatisfied demand exists and will continue to exist in the lower reaches of the Platte River valley where the mid-State development is proposed.

How, then does the proposed Federal plan affect the situation?

As nearly as I can understand the present plans, they contemplate irrigation of something like 365,000 acres in the Platte valley from water brought from the Loup system.

This is another way of saying that under these plans the Platte valley will have more water from the Loup than Tri-County in its original plans, proposed to use on the other side of the Divide.

Unlike the Platte, in which water largely disappears in the summer, the Loup, with its sand-hill supply is very nearly constant. Any substantial amount of water brought across the few miles that separates the Loup and Platte between Kearney and Grand Island would have far reaching effect particularly on the north side of the Platte River. The mid-State project would look very much more feasible with this source of water supply added.

The question then arises as to what should be our State policy with reference to this proposed development. The dominant issue before the people of our State in this postwar period will be how best to turn our resources to the fullest account for our welfare and economic advancement.

The next most important issue before us is how we shall be able to develop that kind of industry in our State which will process the agricultural products into increased value before those products leave the State. We cannot permanently prosper as a people on a raw material economy. Our permanent economic welfare will require a balance between raw material economy and industrial economy.

Our experts estimate that we use for all purposes almost 8,000,000 acre-feet of water annually. This water is now used to develop over half a billion kilowatts of hydroelectric energy annually. We are using something like 6,000 irrigation wells. We have 47 hydroelectric plants. We have something like 1,000 miles of canals. The limiting factor on agricultural development is water. The limiting factor on industrial development is cheap power. An unhappy recollection is that during the drouth years we spent enough on relief in the Missouri Basin to have provided this development of both water and power.

Our progress agriculturally and industrially is inextricably tied up with our intelligent and effective use of our water resources.

We shall accordingly be required to face the issue of our legislative policy with reference to that use.

May I call your attention to the conclusions reached by the water committee of the legislative council a year ago?

"1. Our total supply of water available annually for irrigation is less than the prospective demand from landowners who are willing to pay for water at the rates currently charged.

"2. The available and usable supply of subsurface water for irrigation is very much less than is generally believed, and is in danger of being seriously depleted. Provision must be made for replenishment of the supply if development is to continue.

"3. Experience with pump irrigation suggests the need for State supervision of the use of groundwater, but the people in the areas affected have not been convinced that such supervision is desirable. We do not now have sufficient scientific evidence upon which to base a satisfactory system of supervision, and the need for further observation and study is clearly indicated.

"4. It is imperative that the State, as well as all agencies engaged in operating or developing irrigation projects, recognize the fact that water rights are property and that, as such, they are entitled to all the protection which by our Constitution and laws we give to other property. Neither confiscation nor impairment is justified at any place, or for any cause.

"5. By common consent, and without basis in existing law, the people living in a river valley, as distinguished from the people within the drainage basin of the river but not

in the valley proper, should have first call on unappropriated water of that river.

"6. By like consent, people living within the drainage basin of a river should have, as they now have under existing statutes as interpreted by the Nebraska Supreme Court, a priority of consideration above those living beyond the watershed in other basins.

"7. If neither the people within the valley proper, nor those above the valley but within the drainage basin, make full use of all available water, then the State's policy should be altered to the extent necessary to permit such unused water to be used beyond the watershed in other basins.

"8. In the Platte River Valley, after the direct flow of the river had been fully appropriated, further development became virtually impossible without the construction of storage facilities. The construction of such facilities has been largely suspended, and probably cannot be undertaken again until after the present war. Those areas which have not as yet constructed storage facilities should not be penalized for having failed to do so in the past. Nevertheless, the principle should now be adopted that unless they shall construct such facilities within a reasonable time, they must forfeit their claim to prior consideration over irrigable lands beyond the watershed. The subcommittee is unable to suggest the exact period of time which should be allowed, but feels that the present war emergency should be taken into account, and that some reasonable period should be fixed, to begin as soon as conditions permit a resumption of construction work.

"9. The present law prohibiting transwatershed diversion should be continued until it is established whether or not the available water in the Platte River will be put to beneficial use within the Platte Basin. If it cannot or will not be so used, the law should then be amended to permit its use beyond the watershed.

"10. New proposed developments, such as the Nebraska mid-State project, must furnish satisfactory evidence of the economic possibilities of their proposals. Insofar as the water appropriations of the central Nebraska public power and irrigation district, or any other agency in the State, are valid appropriations, they constitute property rights which cannot be confiscated or impaired. If any new project requires for its development a partial relinquishment of such rights, this must be accomplished by agreement acceptable to the agency now possessing the rights, or by condemnation with just compensation.

"11. If the best interests of the State can be served by combining the central Nebraska public power and irrigation district with the proposed Nebraska mid-State project, and if such combination can be accomplished without loss to the former district, that course should be followed. If losses should be incurred in effecting a combination of the two projects, the mid-State people must be prepared to offset such losses.

"12. For the immediate future no new legislation is indicated. Reference has been made to the probability that further legislation will be required in the future, but such legislation must await the termination of the war, and must be based upon further study and experience.

"13. It is recommended that the legislature make provision for continued study of the water resources of the State by making it the duty of some specified agency of the State government to continue such studies, and by providing the necessary funds therefor. Provision should be made for such continued studies to include a study of the feasibility of small storage reservoirs on the upper portions of drainage areas, together with the effect of such reservoirs on flood control, groundwater supply, and usable supply for power and irrigation.

"14. It is further recommended that the legislature make some provision whereby the State of Nebraska can participate effectively in studies and planning for basin-wide development, and in the negotiation of interstate compacts relating to the use of waters, and the approval of such compacts by Congress."

Since that report was formulated, the Pick-Sloan plan has been presented. If we determine to follow the conclusions of the legislative report we will establish as the basic principles:

1. The people in the valley proper, as distinguished from the watershed, have first call on the waters of a river.

2. The people in the watershed come next.

3. Water that cannot be put to effective beneficial use in the valley or watershed may be used beyond the watershed.

It is submitted that these principles, if put into effect, will furnish a sound policy for the State and will also permit the regional development now under consideration.

C. PETRUS PETERSON.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of bills on the calendar to which there is no objection, beginning with Calendar No. 675, at which point the consideration of the calendar was suspended at the last call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will proceed to state the measures on the calendar, beginning with Calendar No. 675.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN SETTLERS IN THE TOWN SITE OF KETCHUM, IDAHO

The bill (S. 862) to amend the act entitled "An act for the relief of certain settlers in the town site of Ketchum, Idaho," approved July 11, 1940, so as to extend for 3 years the time for making application for benefits thereunder, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act for the relief of certain settlers in the town site of Ketchum, Idaho," approved July 11, 1940, is amended by striking out the words "three years" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "six years."

RAILROAD RIGHT-OF-WAY THROUGH MONTGOMERY BELL PARK, TENNESSEE

The bill (S. 1366) to authorize the State of Tennessee to convey a railroad right-of-way through Montgomery Bell Park was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the State of Tennessee is hereby authorized and empowered to convey a right-of-way for railroad purposes, not in excess of 100 feet in width, to the Nashville, Chattanooga & St. Louis Railway over, through, and across the Montgomery Bell Park in Dickson County, Tenn. (previously known as the Montgomery Bell recreational demonstration area), notwithstanding the express condition contained in deed dated May 25, 1943, from the United States of America to the State of Tennessee, which deed was executed pursuant to the act of June 6, 1942 (56 Stat. 326), entitled "an act to authorize the disposition of recreational demonstration projects and for other purposes." Such conveyance by the State of Tennessee shall not be deemed a breach of the express condition that the State of Tennessee should use the said property exclusively for public park, recreational, and conservation purposes. The State of Tennessee is authorized to expend funds received as a consideration for such conveyance for the acquisition of additional land needed to round out the Montgomery Bell Park area.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 191) to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants to the States for surveying their hospitals and public health centers and for planning construction of additional facilities, and to authorize grants to assist in such construction, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

TEMPORARY INCREASE IN AGE LIMIT FOR APPOINTEES TO THE MILITARY ACADEMY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1123) to provide for a temporary increase in the age limit for appointees to the United States Military Academy.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, this bill was reported by the Committee on Military Affairs and was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, with the recommendation that it study the bill with reference to the features in it pertaining to admission to the Naval Academy. The Committee on Naval Affairs approved the bill and recommended its passage.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. It is merely a temporary measure for the purpose of helping certain young men who have lost their opportunity to be admitted to West Point.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to provide for a temporary increase in the age limit for appointees to the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy."

THE RANK OF BUREAU CHIEFS IN THE NAVY DEPARTMENT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1862) relating to the rank of chiefs of bureaus in the Navy Department, and for other purposes.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, this bill does five things: First, it authorizes a chief of bureau, after 1 year's service, to be promoted to the rank of vice admiral; second, it permits a chief of bureau so promoted to be retired on his own application after 3 years' service with the rank and retired pay of vice admiral; third, it permits a chief of bureau holding the rank of vice admiral to be retired in that rank for physical disabilities at any time during his term of service as such chief of bureau; fourth, it provides that a chief of bureau, upon completion of his term of services as such, shall have the permanent rank of rear admiral if of a lower permanent rank; and, fifth, it provides that an assistant chief of bureau shall have the rank of rear admiral.

Stated briefly, the bill would legalize for the future the ranks which have been temporarily given to some of the chiefs of bureaus during the war.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask for an explanation of section 3 of the bill. On page 2, in line 17, there appears the following language:

SEC. 3. That the terms "chief of bureau" and "assistant to chief of bureau" as used in this act include the Judge Advocate General and the Assistant Judge Advocate General, respectively.

I was wondering if that language would include the Director of the Budget and Reports, as well as Assistant Director of the Budget and Reports.

Mr. WALSH. I am pleased that the Senator has called attention to that matter because the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] is interested in having done what the Senator from New York has suggested, and he recommends it.

Mr. President, I offer an amendment, on page 2, to strike out all of lines 17 to 20, both inclusive, and insert:

SEC. 3. That the terms "chief of bureau" and "assistant to chief of bureau" as used in this act include the Judge Advocate General, the Assistant Judge Advocate General, the Director of Budget and Reports, and the Assistant Director of Budget and Reports, respectively.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

PROSECUTION OF WORK ON CERTAIN RIVERS AND HARBORS PROJECTS

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 105) to provide for proceeding with certain rivers and harbors projects heretofore authorized to be prosecuted after the termination of the war.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, may I ask the able Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], to explain the joint resolution? It would repeal certain provisions of an existing act, and request authorization to proceed to the construction of certain rivers and harbors projects.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Is there provision in the original act with respect to what projects shall be proceeded with?

Mr. MAYBANK. The bill which passed the Senate, which was an authorization bill, was somewhat similar to the bill which was reported favorably by the Post Office and Post Roads Committee. The legislation which was passed last March contained a proviso to the effect that no more work could be started, even though appropriations may have been made, until 6 months after the war had terminated. The reason the Senate incorporated such a provision in the bill was because of the lack of strategic materials and manpower. The pending joint resolution merely gives authority to the Army engineers to go forward with construction whenever the money is appropriated by Congress, without having to wait until 6 months after hostilities have been declared ended.

The joint resolution was unanimously approved by the Committee on Commerce at a meeting held by that committee last month.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I do not want to object to or interfere with any construction in the State of South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. There is not involved any question of construction in the State of South Carolina. The joint resolution applies to an authorization which the Congress passed last March.

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is just the point I am making.

Mr. MAYBANK. No money has been appropriated.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Are there any funds which the engineers might use and proceed without an appropriation?

Mr. MAYBANK. I may say to the Senator from West Virginia that under the present law none of these projects could be constructed until 6 months after the duration.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I believe that many States are interested in this question.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is correct. The interest extends from Maine to California, up and down the Atlantic and Pacific coasts, and along the Gulf.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I think we should examine these projects.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senate already did so and listed, by unanimous consent, those projects in the bill which were approved by the Commerce Committee.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, the bill in question does nothing but remove present prohibitions which were provided in not only the Rivers and Harbors Act, but also in the Flood Control Act, and in the National Highway Act. There was contained in those acts prohibition against the construction of any of the projects provided for until 6 months after the issuance of a proclamation terminating the emergency. Legislation has already been enacted removing such restrictions from the National Highway Act. If this bill is passed and becomes law it will remove the restriction from the comprehensive Rivers and Harbors Act which Congress passed last year. If that is done, divers projects in the act can be commenced only after money has been appropriated for that purpose. As I understand it, those appropriations are with reference to recommendations which have been made by the Board of Army Engineers.

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is the very point I am getting at. May any of these projects be proceeded with, as legislation now stands, even after the removal of the bar of 6 months, until there has been an appropriation for the particular projects?

Mr. CORDON. My answer to the Senator from West Virginia is that they cannot be proceeded with except in those minor instances where there is a revolving fund for maintenance, and so forth.

Mr. HILL. The main purpose of removing the proviso is that Congress may go ahead, if it sees fit, and make appropriations.

Mr. CORDON. Yes; instead of waiting 6 months after a formal declaration of the end of the emergency has been made.

The joint resolution was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That section 2 of the act entitled "An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes," approved March 2, 1945 (Public Law 14, 79th Cong.), is amended by striking out the following: "That no project herein authorized shall be appropriated for or constructed until 6 months after the termination of the present wars in which the United States is engaged unless the construction of such project has been recommended by an authorized defense agency and approved by the President as being necessary or desirable in the interest of the national defense and security, and the President has notified the Congress to that effect: *Provided further.*"

MRS. CATHERINE DRIGGERS AND HER MINOR CHILDREN

The bill (H. R. 801) for the relief of Mrs. Catherine Driggers and her minor children, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LESLIE O. ALLEN

The bill (H. R. 2620) for the relief of Leslie O. Allen, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM WILSON WURSTER

The bill (S. 1448) for the relief of William Wilson Wurster was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

ESTATE OF ALEXANDER McLEAN, DECEASED

The bill (H. R. 2027) for the relief of the estate of Alexander McLean, deceased, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN J. GALL

The bill (H. R. 2160) for the relief of John J. Gall was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ESTATE OF FRANZ TILMAN, DECEASED

The bill (H. R. 2166) for the relief of the estate of Franz Tilman, deceased, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ESTATE OF ED EDMONDSON

The bill (H. R. 2481) for the relief of the estate of Ed Edmondson was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ARLETHIA ROSSER

The bill (H. R. 2399) for the relief of Arlethia Rosser was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CAPT. WERNER HOLTZ

The bill (H. R. 2479) for the relief of Capt. Werner Holtz was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. EVELYN JOHNSON

The bill (H. R. 2642) for the relief of Mrs. Evelyn Johnson was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FLORENCE ZIMMERMAN

The bill (H. R. 2241) for the relief of Florence Zimmerman was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ANNIE M. LANNON

The bill (H. R. 1956) for the relief of Annie M. Lannon was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

G. F. ALLEN

The bill (H. R. 3137) for the relief of G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JAMES ALVES SAUCIER

The bill (S. 831) for the relief of James Alves Saucier was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to James Alves Saucier, of Poplarville, Miss., the sum of $3,000, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by him when he was struck by a United States Army truck at the Gulfport Army Airfield, Mississippi, on August 24, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

OSCAR S. REED

The bill (S. 1077) for the relief of Oscar S. Reed was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Oscar S. Reed, of Auburndale, Mass., the sum of $350, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries and loss of earnings sustained by him as a result of an accident which occurred when the automobile in which he was riding was struck by a United States Navy vehicle, at Portsmouth, N. H., on August 20, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

CHRISTIAN H. KREUSLER

The bill (H. R. 3302) for the relief of Christian H. Kreusler was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FINANCIAL CONTROL OF GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS

The bill (H. R. 3660) to provide for financial control of Government corporations was announced as next in order.

Mr. HILL. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. BUTLER subsequently said: Mr. President, for just a moment I should like to have the attention of the acting majority leader, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], concerning order No. 698, which he asked to have go over.

It is clear, as the Senator indicates, that this is a very important piece of legislation. It has been before the Congress for many months. It originated in the Senate. A similar bill was introduced in the House, where it was amended to some extent, and passed unanimously by the House last September. The House bill came to the Senate, and a subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency and the full committee reported unanimously in favor of accepting the House version of the bill. It is the House bill which is on the calendar today, instead of the original Senate bill.

It is of considerable importance, Mr. President, that the Comptroller General's office know at a reasonably early date whether they are to administer the proposed act during the coming year. I should like to have the assurance of the acting majority leader that the bill may be considered at an early date in order to accommodate the Comptroller General.

Mr. HILL. As the distinguished Senator from Nebraska knows, I am acting as leader only temporarily. As an individual I may say that I shall be glad to cooperate and collaborate with the Senator to the end that the bill may receive early consideration by the Senate.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I suggest that we might take it up at the end of the consideration of the calendar today, if there is to be no substantial debate.

Mr. HILL. I shall endeavor to ascertain the facts about the bill and advise the Senator from Nebraska later as we proceed with the calendar.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, earlier in the day I said it would be necessary for me to be absent from Washington for some time because of certain previous engagements. I now ask unanimous consent that I may be absent from the sessions of the Senate until the business which calls me away is completed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, consent of the Senate is granted.

PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF MEMBERS OF NAVY NURSE CORPS

The bill (S. 1491) to adjust the pay and allowances of members of the Navy Nurse Corps, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, there is a House bill on the calendar on the same subject, House bill 4411, order of business 702, and I ask that that bill be substituted for the Senate bill and be now considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 4411) to adjust the pay and allowances of members of the Navy Nurse Corps, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, Senate bill 1491 will be indefinitely postponed.

EXEMPTION OF NAVY OR COAST GUARD VESSELS FROM CERTAIN REQUIREMENTS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1494) to exempt Navy or Coast Guard vessels of special construction from requirements as to the number, position, range, or arc of visibility of lights and for other purposes; which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs, with amendments, on page 2, line 15, after the words "Secretary of the Navy", to insert "or the Secretary of the Treasury in the case of Coast Guard vessels operating under the Treasury Department"; on line 17, after the word "as", to strike out "he" and insert "either", and on page 3, line 1, to add a new section, as follows:

SEC. 2. When the Secretary of the Navy or the Secretary of the Treasury, or such official or officials as either may designate, shall make any finding or certification as prescribed in section 1, notice of such finding or certification and the character and position of the lights to be displayed on such vessels shall be published in "Notice to Mariners."

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That any requirement as to the number, position, range of visibility, or arc of visibility of lights required to be displayed by vessels under the act of Congress approved August 19, 1890 (title 33, U. S. C., secs. 61–141), entitled "An act to adopt regulations for preventing collisions at sea"; or the act of Congress approved June 7, 1897 (title 33, U. S. C., secs. 154–231), entitled "An act to adopt regulations for preventing collision upon certain harbors, rivers, and inland waters of the United States"; or the act of Congress approved February 8, 1895 (title 33, U. S. C., secs. 241–294), entitled "An act to regulate navigation on the Great Lakes and their connecting and tributary waters"; or the act of Congress approved August 19, 1890 (title 33, U. S. C., secs. 301–351), entitled "An act to adopt special rules for the navigation of harbors, rivers, and inland waters of the United States, except the Great Lakes and their connecting and tributary waters as far east as Montreal, supplementary to the act of August 19, 1890, entitled 'An act to adopt regulations for preventing collisions at sea'", and all laws amendatory thereto, shall not apply to any vessel of the Navy or of the Coast Guard, where the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Treasury in the case of Coast Guard vessels operating under the Treasury Department, or such official or officials as either may designate, shall find or certify that, by reason of special construction, it is not possible with respect to such vessel or class of vessels to comply with the statutory provisions as to the number, position, range of visibility, or arc of visibility of lights. The lights of any such exempted vessel or class of vessels shall, however, comply as closely to the requirements of the applicable statutes as the Secretary shall find to be feasible.

SEC. 2. When the Secretary of the Navy or the Secretary of the Treasury, or such official or officials as either may designate, shall make any finding or certification as prescribed in section 1, notice of such finding or certification and the character and position of the lights to be displayed on such vessel shall be published in "Notice to Mariners."

SEC. 3. This act shall expire on June 30, 1948.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

APPOINTMENT OF CERTAIN PERSONS AS BRIGADIER GENERALS OF THE REGULAR ARMY

The bill (S. 1532) to authorize the appointment of certain persons as permanent brigadier generals of the line of the Regular Army was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, is authorized to appoint as permanent brigadier generals of the line of the Regular Army the following persons: Hoyt S. Vandenberg, presently serving in the temporary grade of lieutenant general in the Army of the United States; James H. Doolittle, presently serving in the temporary grade of lieutenant general in the Army of the United States; Raymond S. McLain, presently serving in the temporary grade of lieutenant general in the Army of the United States; Curtis E. LeMay, presently serving in the temporary grade of major general in the Army of the United States; and Lauris Norstad, presently serving in the temporary grade of major general in the Army of the United States.

SEC. 2. Any persons appointed pursuant to the provisions of the first section of this act shall be counted for the purposes of provisions of law establishing the authorized number of brigadier generals of the line of the Regular Army.

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL PERMANENT MAJOR GENERALS AND BRIGADIER GENERALS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

The bill (S. 1533) to authorize the appointment of certain additional permanent major generals and brigadier generals of the line of the Regular Army, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, is authorized to appoint as permanent major generals of the line of the Regular Army the following officers of the Regular Army serving in the temporary grade of major general in the Army of the United States: Edward P. King, Jr., William F. Sharp, George F. Moore, George M. Parker, Jr., and Albert M. Jones.

SEC. 2. The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, is authorized to appoint as permanent brigadier generals of the line of the Regular Army the following officers of the Regular Army serving in the temporary grade of brigadier general in the Army of the United States: Clifford Bluemel, James R. N. Weaver, Maxon S. Lough, William E. Brougher, Joseph P. Vachon, Charles C. Drake, Bradford G. Chynoweth, Clinton A. Pierce, Arnold J. Funk, and Lewis C. Beebe.

SEC. 3. The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, is authorized to appoint Luther R. Stevens, an officer of the Philippine Constabulary serving as a temporary brigadier general in the Philippine Army, as a permanent brigadier general of the line of the Regular Army.

SEC. 4. Effective as of the date of his relief from active duty, Carl H. Seals, a retired officer of the Regular Army serving on active duty as a temporary brigadier general in the Army of the United States, shall be advanced on the retired list of the Regular Army to the grade of brigadier general, and shall receive the retired pay provided by law for officers retired in that grade.

SEC. 5. Any persons appointed pursuant to the provisions of section 1, 2, or 3 of this act shall be additional general officers of the line of the Regular Army in the grades to which so appointed and shall not be counted for the purposes of provisions of law establishing the authorized numbers of general officers of the line of the Regular Army. Nothing in this act shall be deemed permanently to increase the authorized number of general officers of the line of the Regular Army or to authorize the appointment in the grade of general officer of the line of any successor to any such person.

COMPUTATION OF DOUBLE-TIME CREDITS IN DETERMINING RETIRED PAY

The bill (H. R. 1512) to amend section 9 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (Public Law 607) by providing for the computation of double-time credits awarded between 1898 and 1912 in determining retired pay was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FLORENTINE H. KEELER AND OTHERS

The bill (H. R. 1961) for the relief of Florentine H. Keeler and others was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ROBERT A. HUDSON

The bill (H. R. 4018) for the relief of Robert A. Hudson was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

NANNIE BASS

The bill (H. R. 875) for the relief of Nannie Bass was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SUE FLIPPIN BRATTON

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3198) for the relief of the legal guardian of Sue Flippin Bratton, a minor, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$10,030" and insert in lieu thereof "$8,030."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I should like to be heard on this bill. This case involves a young lady of Lafayette, Tenn., who while a passenger in an automobile was injured because of the negligence of military authorities. A bill was introduced in the House of Representatives by Representative GORE providing for the payment of $25,000. The young lady was very seriously injured. The House passed the bill allowing her $10,000.

When the bill came to the Senate it went to the Committee on Claims, and that committee allowed only $8,000. I have a letter from Representative GORE which I should like to have printed in the RECORD which states that that sum is wholly inadequate. I ask to have the letter printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., November 10, 1945.

Hon. KENNETH MCKELLAR,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MCKELLAR: Your Committee on Claims has favorably reported my bill, H. R. 3198, for the relief of Sue Flippin Bratton, but they have amended it by reducing the amount to $8,030. The same thing was attempted in the House and after a floor fight the House supported $10,000.

Even $10,000 is a measly amount for what has happened to this young lady—a beautiful girl of 18 made an invalid for the rest of her life. I don't see why the Government should be niggardly. It may be that custom will prevent an increase being made, but certainly $10,000 is small enough. I introduced the bill for $25,000 and still think that amount would be inadequate.

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT GORE,
Member of Congress.

Mr. McKELLAR. I appeal to the Senator from Louisiana to join me in requesting that the Senate allow the amount provided by the House.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the Committee on Claims went over this bill very thoroughly. The War Department suggested the payment of $6,000 plus hospital bills, or an aggregate of eight-thousand-and-some dollars. As the distinguished Senator from Tennessee states, the accident in this case was a very serious one, and I doubt if the young lady will ever fully recover; in fact, she is totally disabled.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; she is totally disabled.

Mr. ELLENDER. In the consideration of the case the committee followed the recommendation of the War Department, but in view of the statement of the Senator from Tennessee, I would urge no objection, but will leave the matter to the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. HILL. Senators who feel, as the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Louisiana do, that the claimant should have $10,000, should vote to reject the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HAYDEN in the chair). That is a correct statement.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I may add that this girl was only 16 years of age, just beginning life. She has been permanently disabled, and it seems to me that by all means $10,000 certainly is little enough to be allowed her under the circumstances. I ask that the amendment be rejected.

Mr. CORDON. Will the Senator indicate generally the nature of the injuries which are alleged to be permanent?

Mr. McKELLAR. Among other things, she is paralyzed.

Mr. ELLENDER. She is totally paralyzed.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be glad to read from the committee report, which states:

On February 19, 1944, at about 8:30 p. m., a 1937 Chevrolet sedan, owned by Vernon

Keene, operated by his son, Paul Keene, and in which Sue Flippin Bratton, 16-year-old daughter of Roscoe Bratton, of Lafayette, Tenn., was riding as a passenger, was proceeding south on Halltown Road at an estimated speed of 35 miles per hour. Approximately 270 feet north of the Halltown Road Bridge, the Keene vehicle rounded a curve to the right and as it entered the approach to the bridge it struck the projecting guardrail. The guardrail penetrated the Chevrolet sedan at a point about midway of its left side and struck Sue Flippin Bratton, who was riding on the left side of the rear seat, piercing her body. As a result of the accident Miss Bratton sustained serious personal injuries.

The claims officer, who carefully investigated the accident, found that—

"The evidence * * * clearly reveals negligence or acts of omissions of military personnel acting within the scope of their employment by not properly repairing bridge rail which was definite cause for injury to claimant; however, evidence also shows that the driver of the car in which claimant was riding as a passenger was negligent in that he was not exercising reasonable care in the operation of his vehicle under the circumstances. The proximate cause of the accident is determined as resulting from the joint or concurrent negligence or omission of military personnel and persons other than the claimant."

The War Department, in its report dated July 2, 1945, states the evidence fairly establishes that the accident and resulting personal injuries sustained by Sue Flippin Bratton were not caused by any fault or negligence on her part, but were caused solely by the combined negligence of the military authorities in failing properly to repair the guardrail of the bridge, which had been damaged in connection with the operations of Army troops, and of Paul Keene, the driver of the vehicle in which Miss Flippin was riding, in approaching a narrow one-way bridge at such a speed that he was unable to see the projecting end of the guardrail in time to move further to his right and avoid it.

Under the law of the State of Tennessee the negligence of the driver of a motor vehicle may not be imputed to a guest passenger not engaged on a joint enterprise (*Schwartz* v. *Johnson*, 152 Tenn. 586, 280 S. W. 32). It is the view of the War Department that the legal guardian of Sue Flippin Bratton should be compensated for the medical and hospital expenses incurred in the treatment of Miss Bratton and that reasonable compensation should also be awarded for the benefit of this minor for the serious personal injuries sustained by her in this accident. While the amount of the proposed award, $25,000, is excessive, the War Department would have no objection to the enactment of the bill if it should be amended to provide for an award to the legal guardian of Sue Flippin Bratton in the amount of $8,030 ($2,030 for medical and hospital expenses, and $6,000 for pain and suffering and personal injuries), which, it is believed, would constitute a fair and reasonable settlement for all of the damages sustained by Miss Bratton as a result of this accident.

Mr. CORDON. So far as a specific statement covering the report is concerned, the Senator need not read it to me. The statement that in this case there is total permanent paralysis is sufficient for me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CANDLER COBB

The bill (H. R. 1781) for the relief of Candler Cobb, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOSEPHINE BENHAM

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1457) for the relief of Josephine Benham, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$1,300" and insert "$661.81."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

GENEVIEVE LUND

The bill (H. R. 3790) for the relief of Genevieve Lund was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

STANLEY J. LILLY

The bill (H. R. 3249) for the relief of Stanley J. Lilly was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BEN GREENWOOD AND DOVIE GREENWOOD

The bill (H. R. 2686) for the relief of Ben Greenwood and Dovie Greenwood was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ESTATE OF WILLIAM CARL JONES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1323) for the relief of the estate of William Carl Jones, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$5,405.80" and insert "$3,551.90", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of William Carl Jones, of Merigold, Miss., the sum of $3,551.90, in full satisfaction of the claims of such estate against the United States for compensation for the death of the said William Carl Jones as a result of gunshot wounds inflicted by a guard at the prisoner-of-war camp at Merigold, Miss., on March 24, 1945, and for reimbursement of medical, hospital, and funeral expenses incurred as a result of such injuries and death: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REHABILITATION OF THE ISLAND OF GUAM

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1466) authorizing rehabilitation of the island of Guam, which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs, with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$15,000,000" and insert "$6,000,000", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to construct such permanent facilities for the civil populace of the island of Guam as he may deem necessary for their economic rehabilitation at a cost not to exceed $6,000,000 in aggregate amount.

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to effectuate the purpose of this act.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, may I request an explanation by the Senator from Massachusetts of Senate bill 1466, with particular reference to the fact, as I recall it, that the other day when the Senate passed the rescission bill there was an amendment contained in that bill providing $6,000,000 for rehabilitation work in Guam? I assume that the purpose of the pending bill is to authorize the expenditure of that fund, but I should like to have the Senator clear the matter to my mind.

Mr. WALSH. The Senator has stated the correct explanation of the reason for this bill. It is to authorize an expenditure of $6,000,000. The Navy Department originally requested an authorization of $15,000,000. The committee held extensive hearings and decided that the program of rehabilitation was excessive. It is intended to rebuild structures which were destroyed as a result of the American bombardment of Guam while the Japanese were in control, consisting mainly of public buildings. The plan which was submitted to us called for what we thought was too large a sum of money, and we reduced it to $6,000,000, which was the amount provided in the so-called rescission bill which was passed by the Senate a few days ago.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, am I to understand, then, that the Senator's view is that the enactment of Senate bill 1466 will not operate as an authorization for an additional $6,000,000 appropriation?

Mr. WALSH. No. A committee of the Senate has reported an authorization bill which is the basis for an appropriation. We had reported the bill at the time the money was appropriated. It is simply to operate in conjunction with the appropriation, and represents no additional money.

Mr. CORDON. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONFERRING OF DEGREES BY THE HEAD OF THE POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL OF THE NAVY

The bill (S. 1493) to authorize the head of the postgraduate school of the United States Navy to confer masters and doctors degrees in engineering and related fields, was considered, ordered to be en-

grossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, pursuant to such regulations as the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe, the head of the postgraduate school of the United States Navy is authorized, upon due accreditation from time to time by the appropriate professional authority of the applicable curriculum of such school leading to masters or doctors degrees in engineering or related fields, to confer such degree or degrees on qualified graduates of such school.

REIMBURSEMENT OF NAVY PERSONNEL FOR LOSSES AT NAVAL REPAIR BASE, SAN DIEGO, CALIF.

The bill (S. 1492) to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in building No. 141 at the United States naval repair base, San Diego, Calif., on May 1, 1945, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sum or sums, amounting in the aggregate not to exceed $22,434.28, as may be required by the Secretary of the Navy to reimburse, under such regulations as he may prescribe, certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for the value of personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in building No. 141 at the United States naval repair base, San Diego, Calif., on May 1, 1945: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

ADJUSTMENT OF UNPAID BALANCES IN PAY ACCOUNTS OF NAVAL PERSONNEL

The bill (S. 1467) to provide for adjustment between the proper appropriations, of unpaid balances in the pay accounts of naval personnel on the last day of each fiscal year, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That upon certification to the Comptroller General and the Secretary of the Treasury by the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts on transfer and counterwarrants of the net amount of the unpaid and overpaid balances occurring in the individual pay accounts of naval personnel on the last day of any fiscal year, such net amount shall be charged against the appropriation for the fiscal year in which such balances occurred, and from which such amount was payable, and shall be credited to and payable from the corresponding appropriation for the next succeeding fiscal year.

DECENTRALIZATION OF POWER TO CONVENE AND REVIEW GENERAL COURTS MARTIAL

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1545) to amend article 38 of the Articles for the Government of the Navy, which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs with an amendment on page 2, line 3, after the word "or", to insert "a", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That article 38 of the Articles for the Government of the Navy (Rev. Stat., sec. 1624, art. 38), as amended or superseded by the act approved February 16, 1909, chapter 131, section 10 (35 Stat. 621), as amended by the act approved August 29, 1916, chapter 417 (39 Stat. 586), is amended and reenacted to read as follows:

"ART. 38. Convening authority: General courts martial may be convened:

"First. By the President, the Secretary of the Navy, the commander in chief of a fleet, and the commanding officer of a naval station or a larger shore activity beyond the continental limits of the United States; and

"Second. When empowered by the Secretary of the Navy, by the commanding officer of a division, squadron, flotilla, or other naval force afloat, and by the commandant or commanding officer of any naval district, naval base, or naval station, and by the commandant, commanding officer, or chief of any other force or activity of the Navy or Marine Corps, not attached to a naval district, naval base, or naval station."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the report of the committee printed in the RECORD, so that the record may be available in connection with future legislation on this subject.

There being no objection, the report (No. 706) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1545) to amend article 38 of the articles for the government of the Navy, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with an amendment and recommend that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The purpose of the bill is to make permanent authorized wartime procedures for the decentralization of the power to convene and review general courts martial, and to make certain technical changes in existing law with respect to the convening of general courts martial necessitated by organizational changes in the Navy since the enactment of the present statute.

The first subsection of the bill amends article 38 of the articles for the government of the Navy so as to authorize the convening of general courts martial by the President, the Secretary of the Navy, the commander in chief of a fleet, and the commanding officer of a naval station or larger shore activity beyond the continental United States. The only change that would be made by this part is to extend the authority to commanding officers of larger shore activities than naval stations (such as naval bases) outside the continental United States.

The second subsection enlarges the classes of naval officers who may convene general courts martial, when empowered by the Secretary of the Navy. The present law provides for the convening of general courts martial, when empowered by the Secretary of the Navy, by the commanding officer of a squadron, division, flotilla, or larger naval force afloat, and by the commanding officer of a brigade or larger force on shore beyond the continental United States, and, in time of war, if then so empowered by the Secretary of the Navy, by the commandant of any navy yard or station or brigade or larger force ashore, not attached to a navy yard or station. S. 1545 would eliminate the distinction between times of war and times of peace, and the officers authorized to convene general courts martial, when empowered by the Secretary of the Navy, would include (1) the commanding officer of a division, squadron, flotilla, or other naval force afloat; (2) the commandant or commanding officer of any naval district, naval base, or naval station; and (3) the commandant, commanding officer, or chief of any other force or activity of the Navy or Marine Corps, not attached to a naval district, naval base, or naval station. The enactment of the second subsection of the bill makes it unnecessary to reenact the provisions of subsection 3 of present law and that subsection is not included in the revision of article 38 provided for in the bill.

The changes in existing law are considered necessary to take care of changes in organization and to make the provisions applicable to the present organization of the Navy. The only vital change of substance is the elimination of the restriction on the discretionary power of the Secretary to authorize certain officers to convene general courts martial only in time of war.

Acting under his wartime power to decentralize general courts martial the Secretary has set up wartime procedures for convening general courts martial and reviewing the records of such courts which have substantially decreased the average time necessary for the processing of cases. This has been done without impairing in any way the thoroughness of the review of cases by the Navy Department. It is considered desirable to retain these time-saving procedures in order to expedite the processing of courts martial in the postwar period. This cannot be done under existing law, but can be done under the present bill.

The bill decentralizes the power to convene and review general courts martial which developed under wartime authority, and should be of benefit to the accused due to the elimination of long periods of waiting and delay.

The committee understand that the Department has the question of the administration of naval justice under study with a view of elimfnating some defects which the war has exposed.

The bill, if enacted into law, would involve no additional expense to the Government.

The bill was introduced at the request of the Navy Department and has been cleared by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill from the distinguished chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee?

Mr. WALSH. This bill, Mr. President, relates to court-martial procedure in the Navy. The whole question of revising and modifying and modernizing court-martial proceedings in the Navy is under study, and it is expected that later there will be prepared a bill dealing with the whole subject, which will bring up to date the procedure of courts martials.

This bill merely relates to decentralization of power to set up court-martial boards. Heretofore the Secretary of the Navy has had to set up the board in court-martial proceedings, resulting in great delay and much inconvenience. This bill would permit the Secretary of the Navy to authorize a commanding officer at one of the larger naval bases to designate the personnel of a court-martial board, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. It may not be apropos of this particular legislation, but I should like to ask the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee whether any consideration has been given to a change

in the present court-martial proceedings under the peculiar situation in which we now find ourselves, where hostilities have ceased but the President has not declared the war to be at an end, nor has the Congress made such a declaration. As the Senator well knows, the penalties under court-martial proceedings are much greater during time of war than they are during time of peace, and men charged with what normally would be minor infractions are subject to stiffer penalties than would ordinarily be justified, because we are still technically in a state of war. I was wondering if anything is being done to correct that situation?

Mr. WALSH. No; that subject does not relate to this bill, but it is a very important one, and is being studied by a group of high-class able civilian lawyers. They have been going through all the laws dealing with court-martial procedures and are expecting to make recommendations which the committee will act upon later. This bill relates only to appointment of court-martial boards by a process of decentralization of power.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RETIREMENT OF CERTAIN OFFICERS OF THE NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1405), to authorize the President to retire certain officers of the Regular Navy and the Regular Marine Corps, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs with an amendment to strike out beginning on page 3, sections 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10, and insert new sections in lieu thereof, so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy shall, whenever he deems it advisable, appoint boards of officers to consider and recommend for retirement officers of the line and staff corps of the Regular Navy serving in the ranks of rear admiral and commodore and officers of the Regular Marine Corps serving in the ranks of major general and brigadier general.

SEC. 2. (a) The boards to consider and recommend for retirement officers of the Navy serving in the ranks of rear admiral and commodore shall consist of not less than five officers of the Regular Navy serving in ranks above that of rear admiral except that officers of the staff corps of the rank of rear admiral may be appointed as members of any board appointed for the consideration and recommendation of officers of the staff corps for retirement.

(b) The boards to consider and recommend for retirement officers of the Marine Corps serving in the rank of major general shall consist, so far as practicable, of three line officers of the Regular Marine Corps serving in ranks above that of major general. If there be an insufficient number of such officers available, the deficiency shall be supplied by the appointment to the board of officers of the line of the Regular Navy serving in ranks above that of rear admiral.

(c) The boards to consider and recommend for retirement officers of the Marine Corps serving in the rank of brigadier general shall consist, so far as practicable, of five line officers of the Regular Marine Corps serving in ranks above that of brigadier general. If there be an insufficient number of such officers available, the deficiency shall be supplied by the appointment to the board of officers of the line of the Regular Navy serving in the rank of rear admiral or above.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to convene boards of officers of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps to consider and recommend for retirement officers of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps serving in the ranks of captain and below in the Navy, and colonel and below in the Marine Corps, within such categories or groups of such officers as shall be specified in the precepts convening such boards. The members of such boards shall be senior in rank to any officer under consideration.

SEC. 4. The recommendations of each board convened pursuant to this act shall be submitted by the Secretary of the Navy with his recommendations to the President for approval or disapproval, in whole or in part.

SEC. 5. Each officer recommended for retirement pursuant to this act shall, if such recommendation be approved by the President, be placed on the retired list on the first day of such month as may be set by the Secretary of the Navy but not later than the first day of the seventh month after the date of approval by the President.

SEC. 6. When any officer of the Regular Navy or the Regular Marine Corps or the Reserve components thereof has completed more than 20 years of active service in the Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, or the Reserve components thereof, including active duty for training at least 10 years of which shall have been active commissioned service, he may at any time thereafter, upon his own application, in the discretion of the President, be placed upon the retired list on the first day of such month as the President may designate.

SEC. 7. (a) Each officer retired pursuant to the foregoing sections of this act shall be placed on the retired list with the highest rank, permanent or temporary, held by him while on active duty, if his performance of duty in such rank as determined by the Secretary of the Navy has been satisfactory. In any case where, as determined by the Secretary of the Navy, any such officer has not performed satisfactory duty in the highest rank held by him while on active duty, he shall be placed on the retired list with the next lower rank in which he has served but not lower than his permanent rank. Officers retired pursuant to the foregoing sections of this act shall receive retired pay at the rate of 2½ percent of the active-duty pay with longevity credit of the rank with which retired, multiplied by the number of years of service for which entitled to credit in the computation of their pay while on active duty, not to exceed a total of 75 percent of said active duty pay: *Provided*, That a fractional year of 6 months or more shall be considered a full year in computing the number of years service by which the rate of 2½ percent is multiplied: *Provided further*, That officers whose computation of pay on the active list is not baesd upon years of service shall receive as retired pay 75 percent of their active duty pay.

(b) Nothing within this section shall prevent any officer from being placed on the retired list with the highest rank and with the highest retired pay to which he might be entitled under other provisions of law.

(c) The rank in which an officer was serving on August 12, 1945, is the highest rank in which the officer may be retired and upon which his retired pay may be based pursuant to this section, unless under provisions of law other than those contained within this section he is entitled to a higher rank on the retired list or to a higher retired pay, or unless at the time of retirement he is serving in a higher permanent grade or rank.

SEC. 8. (a) Section 10 of the act approved July 24, 1941 (55 Stat. 605), is, hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 10. (a) Personnel appointed or advanced under the authority of this act may be continued in their temporary status during such period as the President may determine, but not longer than 6 months after the termination of war or national emergency or, in the case of reserve and retired personnel, not longer than the period herein specified or the date of release from active duty whichever is the earlier and in no case longer than 6 months after the termination of war or national emergency. Upon the termination of their temporary status such personnel on the active list of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps shall assume their permanent status and those of the retired list and of the respective Reserve components, including the Fleet Reserve and Fleet Marine Corps Reserve, shall have, when returned to an inactive status, the highest grade and rank in which, as determined by the Secretary of the Navy, they served satisfactorily under a temporary appointment, unless entitled to the same or higher grade and rank pursuant to section 8 of this act, as now or hereafter amended.

"(b) (1) Personnel of the retired list returned to an inactive status with higher rank pursuant to subsection (a) shall receive retired pay computed at the rate prescribed by law and applicable in each individual case but based upon such higher rank.

"(2) Personnel of the active list of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps and personnel of the Fleet Reserve and Fleet Marine Corps Reserve appointed or advanced under the authority of this act shall, when subsequently retired, if not otherwise entitled to the same or higher grade and rank or retired pay, be advanced to the highest grade and rank in which, as determined by the Secretary of the Navy, they served satisfactorily under temporary appointments, and shall receive retired pay computed at the rate prescribed by law and applicable in each individual case but based upon such higher rank.

"(c) Personnel of the classes described above who have been retired or released from active duty prior to the date of this amendment shall be entitled to the benefits of this section from the date of retirement or release from active duty, as the case may be.

"(d) Personnel accorded higher rank pursuant to this section shall, if subsequently assigned active duty, be recalled to active duty in their permanent grades, ranks, or ratings, to which they are entitled under other provisions of law."

"(e) The rank in which an officer was serving on August 12, 1945, is the highest rank in which the officer may be retired and upon which his retired pay may be based pursuant to this section, unless under provisions of law other than those contained within this section he is entitled to a higher rank on the retired list or to a higher retired pay, or unless at the time of retirement he is serving in a higher permanent grade or rank."

(b) Nothing contained in this section shall be construed as altering or amending any provision of section 7 of the act approved June 30, 1942 (56 Stat. 465).

SEC. 9. When any officer of the Navy or Marine Corps serving in a rank below that of fleet admiral has attained the age of 62 years, he shall be placed upon the retired list by the President with the highest rank, permanent or temporary, held by him while on active duty and with retired pay equal to 75 percent of the active duty pay of such rank: *Provided, however*, That the President may, in his discretion, defer placing any such officer on the retired list for the length of time he deems advisable but not later than the date upon which such officer attains the age of 64 years, except that not more than 10 officers whose retirement is so deferred shall be on the active list at any one time; *And provided further*, That no officer of the Navy or Marine Corps shall be placed upon the retired list pursuant to this section until the first day of the sixth month following

the date of approval of this act or until the date upon which he would be retired for age pursuant to law existing prior to the date of approval of this act, whichever may be the earlier.

SEC. 10. The provisions of this act, except as may be necessary to adapt the same thereto, shall apply to personnel of the Coast Guard in relationship to the Coast Guard in the same manner and to the same extent as they apply to personnel of the Navy in relationship to the Navy: *Provided*, That wherever authority is given to the Secretary of the Navy, similar authority shall be deemed given to the Secretary of the Treasury to be exercised with respect to the Coast Guard at such time or times as the Coast Guard shall be operating under the Treasury Department: *Provided further*, That the boards to consider and recommend for retirement officers of the Coast Guard serving in the ranks of rear admiral and commodore shall be composed of senior Coast Guard officers if available or otherwise as the Secretary shall determine.

SEC. 11. The following acts and parts of acts are hereby repealed:

(a) Section 13 and subsection (e) of section 15 of the act of June 23, 1938 (52 Stat. 951 and 952).

(b) Section 1444 of the Revised Statutes of the United States as amended by that portion of the act of August 29, 1916 (39 Stat. 579), reading: "except as herein otherwise provided, hereafter the age for retirement of all officers of the Navy shall be 64 years instead of 62 years as now prescribed by law"; section 2 of the act of January 28, 1929 (ch. 109, 45 Stat. 1142); and section 6 of the act of June 30, 1942 (56 Stat. 465).

(c) Subsection 12 (e) of the act of June 23, 1938 (52 Stat. 950).

SEC. 12. The provisions of section 3 of this act shall terminate on June 30 of the fiscal year following that in which the present war shall be declared to be ended by proclamation of the President or by an act or resolution of Congress.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, one of the principal features of the bill is that which reduces the retirement age from 64 years to 62 years, but gives the President the power to retain 10 admirals who have reached the age of 62 if in his discretion the Navy needs their services. The reason for this reduction in age is to make promotions more rapid, and also to allow younger men to advance to the rank of admiral and assume the duties of admiral earlier than they would if the age were kept at 64 years. The legislation with respect to the age for retirement of admirals is permanent. So are the provisions for the selection of admirals. The other provisions expire 1 year after the war. The real purpose of these provisions is to readjust the officer personnel before the postwar Navy is established.

Another feature of the bill which is of considerable importance is the retirement provision. Up to the time of the war the Navy Department eliminated through the selective board system what might be called, to use a slang term, "dead wood." Some officers of limited ability have been carried during the war because of their experience and training and because they were of value and there was a great pressure for officers. This bill permits the Secretary of the Navy to establish boards to consider the records of officers and to eliminate those who, for one reason or another, are found to have become unsatisfactory or unable to perform their duties. It sometimes happens that an officer, when he is promoted, is physically well and mentally alert and able to carry on the job, but after 2 or 3 years, for one reason or another, he may not be able to measure up to the standard required and yet is not of sufficient age to retire. This bill would permit the setting up of boards to do what in peacetime was done by the selection board. It is expected that it will result in giving the Navy more efficient officers, and also remove officers who are reaching advanced age, so that younger officers, more alert and better qualified to perform their duties, will be selected.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. I should like to inquire of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts whether this bill authorizes the retirement of commissioned officers in the Navy who have a temporary advanced grade and authorizes retirement pay based upon such temporary grade?

Mr. WALSH. Yes. The bill authorizes retirement at the highest rank which may have been reached. Of course as the Senator suggests, some ranks are only temporary. When the bill originally came before the committee it dealt only with officers, but we have included enlisted men, so that an enlisted man who was promoted temporarily during the war, let us say from a petty officer first class to lieutenant, would retire as lieutenant under this bill. The bill applies the same retirement provision to enlisted men as to officers. That is one thing the committee insisted upon. There is not one provision or right in this bill which does not apply to enlisted men as well as to officers.

Furthermore the bill deals with promotions, so the enlisted man would receive the temporary promotion illustrated by the case of the petty officer. The original bill applied only to officers.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. If I am correct, section 6 of the act of June 30, 1942, which provided for the retirement and the granting of retirement pay based upon temporary grade at the time of retirement, as I understand, is repealed by section 11 of the pending bill.

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. CORDON. This bill, although repealing that section, contains other sections, carrying into force the provisions of that section.

Mr. WALSH. Yes; that is true.

Mr. CORDON. I am particularly interested in the matter, Mr. President, because from my investigation I find that that same right is not granted to officers of the Army. I believe it should be granted to the officers of the Navy, but I believe it should also be granted to the officers of the Army, and I hope the Committee on Military Affairs at the appropriate time will give careful consideration to legislation I shall offer dealing with that subject.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, if the Senator will wait a moment, I should like to offer two amendments to the committee amendment.

On page 11, line 14, before the word "Navy", I move that the word "Regular" be inserted.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WALSH. On page 8, line 24, after the figures "1945", I move to insert the following: "or if a prisoner of war during World War II, the rank in which he was serving on November 1, 1945."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WALSH. On page 11, line 4, after the figures "1945", I move to insert the following: "or if a prisoner of war during World War II, the rank in which he was serving on November 1, 1945."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WALSH. The last two amendments, on page 8 and also on page 11, were suggested by the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], and I offered them on behalf of the Senator from Wyoming and myself. The amendment provides that a prisoner of war who has not been where he could receive his promotion will be considered to have been promoted, and will receive the benefits of retirement as though he had not been a prisoner of war.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. BALL. I have scanned the bill hurriedly. I am wondering how it changes the present retirement pay of line officers.

Mr. WALSH. It makes no change in the rank at which an officer is retired, but bases his retired pay on the pay of the highest rank held during the war. It is a bill to make provision for moving out of the Navy, officers who are not satisfactory but who were not weeded out during the war as selections out of the Navy were suspended.

Mr. BALL. They can be retired at their temporary grade, with retirement pay up to 75 percent of their pay.

Mr. WALSH. That is true.

Mr. BALL. That applies even though they may have had only 20 years' service under the first section?

Mr. WALSH. Yes. The retirement covers three periods, one of 20 years, another of 30 years, and a third of 40 years.

The bill is intended to give retirement pay at the highest rank attained, somewhat as compensation or reward for services. However, with respect to retirement at the age of 62, which is the general retirement age, the law applies only to regular officers and not to reserve officers. The reason for that is that a Reserve officer might be called for 2 or 3 years, and if he received the same retirement pay as that received by a regular officer at the age of 62, he would be in the same position as a regular officer who had served all his life in the Navy. So a distinction is made at the age of 62 between the regular officer and the Reserve officer. Of course, the retirement pay of a Reserve officer is calculated upon the basis of his rank, taking into consideration the number of years of service.

Mr. BALL. I take it that the Navy is now retiring officers at their temporary

grade at approximately the same retirement pay as is provided under this bill.

Mr. WALSH. Yes, when they are retired for physical disability or combat injuries.

Mr. BALL. The bill would extend the privilege to officers in lower grades.

Mr. WALSH. To officers in all grades.

Mr. BALL. The Navy has been granting such retirement pay on a temporary basis under the war powers.

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. BALL. What change in permanent law prior to the war would be involved?

Mr. WALSH. Of course, there were no temorary ranks prior to the war. All were permanent ranks.

Mr. BALL. And the retirement pay was 75 percent of the pay at whatever rank a man was retired.

Mr. WALSH. On a permanent basis.

Mr. BALL. At the permanent rank.

Mr. WALSH. Yes; whatever the permanent rank was.

Mr. BALL. If a rear admiral goes back to the rank of captain, and serves 5 years without receiving a promotion, and is then retired, he will retire on the basis of his temporary rank of rear admiral, which he held during the war.

Mr. WALSH. That is correct. The same is true of enlisted men. If a man served for 18 years as a seaman, but during the war had risen to the rank of lieutenant, junior grade, or lieutenant, senior grade, and after the war goes back to the rank of enlisted seaman, he will retire with the rank of lieutenant.

Mr. BALL. In the case of Regular officers who reach the age of 62, they have received retirement pay to the extent of 75 percent of the pay of their permanent rank. That has been true all along, under the permanent law.

Mr. WALSH. Yes. There is no change whatever in that respect. The principal reason for the bill is that it is expected that there will now be some eliminations, by reason of the boards which are to be established under the provisions of the bill.

Mr. BALL. Does the Senator know how that retirement allowance compares with that of the Army, or the judiciary? Of course, Congress has none.

Mr. WALSH. I understand that Army and Navy pay and allowances are the same.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The retirement age in the Army has been reduced to 60 years, instead of 62 years.

Mr. WALSH. But the pay is the same. If there were any discriminations by way of higher retirement pay in the Army than in the Navy, or vice versa, the respective committees would hear about it very quickly, and corrective legislation would be introduced.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. BALL. Does the Senator happen to know what the retirement pay for Federal judges is?

Mr. WALSH. As I recall, they are retired on full pay.

Mr. BALL. That is my understanding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the President to retire certain officers and enlisted men of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and for other purposes."

The preamble was agreed to.

Mr. WALSH. I request that the report on this bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the report of the committee will be printed in the RECORD, as requested by the Senator from Massachusetts.

The report (No. 701) is as follows:

The Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1405) to authorize the President to retire certain officers of the Regular Navy and the Regular Marine Corps, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments and recommend that the bill as amended do pass.

Amend the bill as follows: On pages 3, 4, 5, and 6 strike out sections 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to convene boards of officers of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps to consider and recommend for retirement officers of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps serving in the ranks of captain and below in the Navy, and colonel and below in the Marine Corps, within such categories or groups of such officers as shall be specified in the precepts convening such boards. The members of such boards shall be senior in rank to any officer under consideration.

"SEC. 4. The recommendations of each board convened pursuant to this act shall be submitted by the Secretary of the Navy with his recommendations to the President for approval or disapproval, in whole or in part.

"SEC. 5. Each officer recommended for retirement pursuant to this act shall, if such recommendation be approved by the President, be placed on the retired list on the 1st day of such month as may be set by the Secretary of the Navy but not later than the 1st day of the 7th month after the date of approval by the President.

"SEC. 6. When any officer of the Regular Navy or the Regular Marine Corps or the Reserve components thereof has completed more than 20 years of active service in the Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, or the Reserve components thereof, including active duty for training, at least 10 years of which shall have been active commissioned service, he may at any time thereafter, upon his own application, in the discretion of the President, be placed upon the retired list on the first day of such month as the President may designate.

"SEC. 7. (a) Each officer retired pursuant to the foregoing sections of this act shall be placed on the retired list with the highest rank, permanent or temporary, held by him while on active duty, if his performance of duty in such rank as determined by the Secretary of the Navy has been satisfactory. In any case where, as determined by the Secretary of the Navy, any such officer has not performed satisfactory duty in the highest rank held by him while on active duty, he shall be placed on the retired list with the next lower rank in which he has served but not lower than his permanent rank. Officers retired pursuant to the foregoing sections of this act shall receive retired pay with longevity credit at the rate of 2½ percent of the active-duty pay of the rank with which retired, multiplied by the number of years of service for which entitled to credit in the computation of their pay while on active duty, not to exceed a total of 75 percent of said active-duty pay: *Provided*, That a fractional year of 6 months or more shall be considered a full year in computing the number of years' service by which the rate of 2½ percent is multiplied: *Provided further*, That officers whose computation of pay on the active list is not based upon years of service shall receive as retired pay 75 percent of their active duty pay.

"(b) Nothing within this section shall prevent any officer from being placed on the retired list with the highest rank and with the highest retired pay to which he might be entitled under other provisions of law.

"(c) The rank in which an officer was serving on August 12, 1945, is the highest rank in which the officer may be retired and upon which his retired pay may be based pursuant to this section, unless under provisions of law other than those contained within this section he is entitled to a higher rank on the retired list or to a higher retired pay, or unless at the time of retirement he is serving in a higher permanent grade or rank.

"SEC. 8. (a) Section 10 of the act approved July 24, 1941 (55 Stat. 605), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 10. (a) Personnel appointed or advanced under the authority of this act may be continued in their temporary status during such period as the President may determine, but not longer than 6 months after the termination of war or national emergency or, in the case of reserve and retired personnel, not longer than the period herein specified or the date of release from active duty whichever is the earlier and in no case longer than 6 months after the termination of war or national emergency. Upon the termination of their temporary status such personnel on the active list of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps shall assume their permanent status and those of the retired list and of the respective Reserve Components, including the Fleet Reserve and Fleet Marine Corps Reserve, shall have, when returned to an inactive status, the highest grade and rank in which, as determined by the Secretary of the Navy, they served satisfactorily under a temporary appointment, unless entitled to the same or higher grade and rank pursuant to section 8 of this act, as now or hereafter amended.

"'(b) (1) Personnel of the retired list returned to an inactive status with higher rank pursuant to subsection (a) shall receive retired pay computed at the rate prescribed by law and applicable in each individual case but based upon such higher rank.

"'(2) Personnel of the active list of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps and personnel of the Fleet Reserve and Fleet Marine Corps Reserve appointed or advanced under the authority of this act shall, when subsequently retired, if not otherwise entitled to the same or higher grade and rank or retired pay, be advanced to the highest grade and rank in which, as determined by the Secretary of the Navy, they served satisfactorily under temporary appointments, and shall receive retired pay computed at the rate prescribed by law and applicable in each individual case but based upon such higher rank.

"'(c) Personnel of the classes described above who have been retired or released from active duty prior to the date of this amendment shall be entitled to the benefits of this section from the date of retirement or release from active duty, as the case may be.

"'(d) Personnel accorded higher rank pursuant to this section shall, if subsequently

assigned active duty, be recalled to active duty in their permanent grades or ranks or ratings to which they are entitled under other provisions of law.

"'(e) The rank in which an officer was serving on August 12, 1945, is the highest rank in which the officer may be retired and upon which his retired pay may be based pursuant to this section, unless under provisions of law other than those contained within this section he is entitled to a higher rank on the retired list or to a higher retired pay, or unless at the time of retirement he is serving in a higher permanent grade or rank.'"

(b) Nothing contained in this section shall be construed as altering or amending any provision of section 7 of the act approved June 30, 1942 (56 Stat. 465).

"SEC. 9. When any officer of the Navy or Marine Corps serving in a rank below that of fleet admiral has attained the age of 62 years, he shall be placed upon the retired list by the President with the highest rank, permanent or temporary, held by him while on active duty and with retired pay equal to 75 percent of the active duty pay of such rank: *Provided, however*, That the President may, in his discretion, defer placing any such officer on the retired list for the length of time he deems advisable but not later than the date upon which such officer attains the age of 64 years, except that not more than 10 officers whose retirement is so deferred shall be on the active list at any one time: *And provided further*, That no officer of the Navy or Marine Corps shall be placed upon the retired list pursuant to this section until the 1st day of the 6th month following the date of approval of this act or until the date upon which he would be retired for age pursuant to law existing prior to the date of approval of this act, whichever may be the earlier.

"SEC. 10. The provisions of this act, except as may be necessary to adapt the same thereto, shall apply to personnel of the Coast Guard in relationship to the Coast Guard in the same manner and to the same extent as they apply to personnel of the Navy in relationship to the Navy: *Provided*, That wherever authority is given to the Secretary of the Navy, similar authority shall be deemed given to the Secretary of the Treasury to be exercised with respect to the Coast Guard at such time or times as the Coast Guard shall be operating under the Treasury Department: *Provided further*, That the boards to consider and recommend for retirement officers of the Coast Guard serving in the ranks of rear admiral and commodore shall be composed of senior Coast Guard officers if available or otherwise as the Secretary shall determine.

"SEC. 11. The following acts and parts of acts are hereby repealed:

"(a) Section 13 and subsection (e) of section 15 of the act of June 23, 1938 (52 Stat. 951 and 952).

"(b) Section 1444 of the Revised Statutes of the United States as amended by that portion of the act of August 29, 1916 (39 Stat. 579), reading: 'except as herein otherwise provided, hereafter the age for retirement of all officers of the Navy shall be 64 years instead of 62 years as now prescribed by law'; section 2 of the act of January 28, 1929 (ch. 109, 45 Stat. 1142); and section 6 of the act of June 30, 1942 (56 Stat. 465).

"(c) Subsection 12 (e) of the act of June 23, 1938 (52 Stat. 950).

"SEC. 12. The provisions of section 3 of this act shall terminate on June 30 of the fiscal year following that in which the present war shall be declared to be ended by proclamation of the President or by an act or resolution of Congress."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to authorize the President to retire certain officers and enlisted men of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and for other purposes."

The purpose of the bill is to provide for a readjustment of officer personnel which is considered essential in an efficient and vigorous postwar navy. During the war, laws governing separation from the service by retirement except in cases of physically incapacitated officers and those who reached the statutory retirement age were suspended by the Congress. The voluntary retirement provisions of law, such as retirement in the discretion of the President after 40, 30, or 20 years, respectively, of service were suspended administratively. The employment of every officer of the Regular Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard whose services could be employed in any capacity whatsoever was so employed during the war in an effort to conserve personnel in the interest of the critical manpower shortage in war industry.

The appropriation act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, approved June 11, 1940, suspended the involuntary retirement of officers adjudged fitted under the provisions of the Personnel Act of June 23, 1938. The act of June 30, 1942, suspended many of the provisions of the Personnel Act of June 23, 1938, regarding permanent promotions and retirement. As a consequence, there are many officers on the active list of the Navy today, particularly in the higher ranks, whose services can no longer be efficiently employed.

In order to make the necessary readjustment in the active list of the Regular Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard, the present bill will authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convene boards, composed of senior officers, to review the records of officers and make recommendations concerning their retirement. The bill also lowers the current statutory age of retirement from 64 to 62 for all officers below the rank of fleet admiral with the provision that the President may defer the age retirement of not to exceed 10 such officers for a period of 2 years for special assignment.

General Vandegrift, Commandant of the Marine Corps, states that there are today a few officers of the Regular Marine Corps who have been promoted through the various grades for years who, when assigned to a responsible command in combat, demonstrated that they were unfit professionally for command assignments. There were other officers who were not able physically to cope with combat conditions and some who broke mentally. Some of the officers in the latter categories fully recovered after hospitalization. Such officers should not be continued on the active list of the Marine Corps, because they have clearly shown that they are not capable of meeting such conditions and therefore should not be retained.

The recent war has emphasized the necessity for youth and vigor in maintaining the Navy and Marine Corps at peak performance under the strain of combat. World War II has conclusively demonstrated that alert and youthful officers are absolutely essential in the successful prosecution of any war.

The committee are of the opinion that enactment of the present bill is necessary to insure that our post-war Navy be officered with young, alert, and vigorous officers.

A SECTION BY SECTION EXPLANATION OF THE BILL IS AS FOLLOWS

SECTION 1

Section 13 of an act approved June 23, 1938, provided that, if in time of peace, the average number of vacancies in the grade of rear admiral, in any year was less than eight, the Secretary of the Navy should convene a board consisting of the Chief of Naval Operations; the commander in chief, United States Fleet; and the commander, Battle Force, to recommend for retirement a sufficient number of rear admirals to cause an average of eight vacancies per year.

Section 15 (e) of the same act provided that boards should be appointed to recommend for retirement a sufficient number of general officers of the line of the Marine Corps to insure that there would be an average of two vacancies per year.

These two sections of the act were temporarily suspended during the war and no rear admirals of the Navy or general officers of the line of the Marine Corps were retired in accordance with these two sections of the above-mentionel act.

Section 1 of the bill (S. 1405), authorizes the Secretary of the Navy to appoint boards to consider and recommend officers of the Regular Navy serving in the ranks of rear admiral and commodore and officers of the Regular Marine Corps serving in the ranks of major general and brigadier general for retirement.

The bill does not limit the number of officers who may be recommended for retirement. Also, it authorizes the appointment of boards to consider and recommend for retirement officers of the Staff Corps as well as officers of the line.

SECTION 2 (A), (B) AND (C)

The composition of boards for similar duty under the act of June 23, 1938, could not be appointed because of changes in naval organization. This act provided for a board consisting of the Chief of Naval Operations; commander in chief, United States Fleet; and commander, Battle Force. The office of commander in chief, United States Fleet; and Chief of Naval Operations is now vested in one and the same officer. The office of commander, Battle Force, no longer exists.

Section 2 (a) of the present bill provides that boards to consider and recommend for retirement officers in the rank of rear admiral and commodore shall consist of not less than five officers of the Regular Navy in ranks above rear admiral. Officers of the Staff Corps are eligible for membership on boards for consideration of Staff Corps officers.

Section 2 (b) provides that boards to consider and recommend for retirement officers in the rank of major general of the Marine Corps shall consist, as far as practicable, of three line officers of the Regular Marine Corps in ranks above major general. If insufficient numbers of Marine Corps officers are available, officers of the line of the Regular Navy in ranks above rear admiral shall be appointed to supply the deficiency.

Section 2 (c) provides that boards to consider and recommend for retirement officers in the rank of brigadier general of the Marine Corps shall consist, so far as practicable, of five line officers of the Regular Marine Corps in ranks above brigadier general. If insufficient numbers of Marine Corps officers are available, officers of the line of the Regular Navy in the rank of rear admiral or above shall be appointed to supply the deficiency.

SECTION 3

The act of June 23, 1938, modified the system of promotion by selection in the Navy and Marine Corps. Officers not selected for promotion were either retired or discharged. Some of the provisions of this act regarding involuntary retirement of officers were suspended by the act of June 11, 1940, and all of its provisions with respect to permanent promotions and retirement were suspended by the act of June 30, 1942. Consequently, there are many officers on the active list of Navy and Marine Corps today who, under normal peacetime conditions, would have been selected for permanent promotion to higher rank or would have been placed on the retired list.

Section 3 of the present bill authorized the Secretary of the Navy to convene boards of officers of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps to consider and recommend for retirement officers of the ranks of captain and below in the Regular Navy and of the rank of colonel and below in the Regular Marine Corps. The Secretary of the Navy shall prescribe, in the

precept convening the boards, the categories or groups of officers to be considered by each board. Members of such boards shall be senior in rank to any officer under consideration.

This section is temporary legislation and will expire shortly after the termination of the present war. The enactment of this section will effect the retirement of many officers who would normally have been retired in peacetime.

SECTION 4

The recommendations of the selection boards convened under the act of June 23, 1938, were submitted to the President for his approval or disapproval.

Section 4 of the present bill provides that recommendations of each board shall be submitted by the Secretary of the Navy with his recommendation to the President for approval or disapproval, in whole or in part.

SECTION 5

Under the act of June 23, 1938, officers who failed of selection for promotion were retired on June 30 of the fiscal year in which they fail of selection the second time.

Section 5 of the bill, S. 1405, provides the date on which officers shall be placed on the retired list pursuant to recommendations of boards approved by the President. This date is the first day of the month set by the Secretary of the Navy but not later than the first day of the seventh monh after approval of the recommendation by the President.

SECTION 6

Under existing law all officers of the Navy below the rank of vice admiral and all officers of the Marine Corps below the rank of lieutenant general are placed upon the retired list upon reaching the age of 64. Any officer, upon his own application, shall be placed upon the retired list after completing 40 years of active service. Any officer may be retired, upon his own application, in the discretion of the President, after 30 years of active service. Officers of the line of the Navy and Marine Corps, except chief warrant officers, may be placed on the retired list, on their own application, at the discretion of the President, after 20 years of service. Officers of the Naval Reserve may be placed on the honorary retired list of the Naval Reserve after 20 years of active service provided the last 10 years of such service have been performed during the 11 years immediately preceding their transfer to the honorary retired list of the Naval Reserve.

Section 6 of the present bill amends existing law by providing that any officer of the Regular Navy or Marine Corps or of the Reserve components therof may, in the discretion of the President, be retired on his own application after more than 20 years of active service, at least 10 years of which must have been active commission service. This provision will equalize the voluntary retirement privilege after 20 years of active service for all types of officers. The provision will be similar for line and staff, for Regular and Reserve in the same manner throughout.

SECTION 7 (A) AND (B)

Existing law provides that all Regular officers who served in World War II, and who are retired or return to an inactive status, shall receive the highest rank held by them on active duty, but with their retired pay based upon their permanent ranks. Where personnel are specially commended for heroism in combat with the enemy, they receive an additional promotion of one rank when placed on the retired list but with their retired pay based upon their permanent ranks. In general, retired pay is computed at the rate of 2½ percent of the pay of the permanent rank multiplied by the number of years' service for which entitled for pay purposes on active duty, not to exceed 75 percent.

Section 7 (a) of the present bill provides that officers recommended for retirement pursuant to the foregoing sections of the bill shall be placed on the retired list with the highest rank held on the active list, provided performance of duty in that rank has been satisfactory, and with retired pay based upon 2½ percent of the pay of the rank in which retired multiplied by the number of years of service, not to exceed 75 percent. If an officer's service in the highest rank has not been satisfactory he shall be retired in the next lower rank, but not below his permanent rank with retired pay based on such lower rank. The temporary rank in which an officer was serving on August 12, 1945 (VJ-day), is the highest rank in which an officer may be retired pursuant to this section. His retired pay would be based upon that rank.

Section 7 (b), is a saving clause to insure higher rank and pay if so entitled under other laws.

SECTION 8 (A) AND (B)

The act of July 24, 1941, provides for the temporary promotion of officers of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard during periods of war or national emergency. Section 10 of that act provides that officers who receive these temporary promotions shall, when retired or placed on an inactive duty status receive the highest rank in which they served on active duty with retired pay based upon their permanent ranks. Section 10 has been construed as not permitting officers of the Naval Reserve to return to an inactive status in the highest rank held while on active duty.

Section 8 (a) of the bill, S. 1405, would amend section 10 of the act of July 24, 1941, in the following particulars:

(a) Reserve officers placed on an inactive duty status would hold the highest rank in which they served satisfactorily on active duty under a temporary commission. Reserve officers receive no pay while on inactive duty. If recalled to active duty they would return in their permanent ranks.

(b) Retired officers when they resume an inactive status would hold the highest rank they held satisfactorily on the active list under a temporary commission and their retired pay would be based upon the pay of that rank. If again recalled to active duty they would return in the rank in which originally retired.

(c) Regular officers who will remain on active duty would revert to their permanent ranks. When subsequently retired they would be retired in the highest rank satisfactorily held under a temporary commission with retired pay based upon the pay of that rank unless entitled to a higher rank and higher retired pay. It is to be noted that officers of this category will continue in service with the probability of attaining or exceeding by permanent rank their highest temporary rank in the years of service that follow. Many of the retirements of office in this category will therefore be governed by other provisions of law.

(d) Members of the Fleet Reserve and Fleet Marine Corps Reserve when eventually returned to an inactive status in such Reserves or when retired would be so returned or retired in the highest rank satisfactorily held under a temporary commission while on active duty, with retired or retainer pay based upon that rank. If recalled to active duty, they would be recalled in the ranks or ratings in which originally transferred to the Reserve.

The temporary rank in which an officer was serving on August 12, 1945 (VJ-day), is the highest rank in which an officer may be retired pursuant to this section. His retired pay would be based upon that rank.

An amendment to section 10 of the act of July 24, 1941, is contained in section 7 of the act of June 30, 1942 (56 Stat. 465). This amendment permits temporary appointments made under authority of the act of July 24, 1941, to continue in force until 6 months after June 30 of the fiscal year following that in which the present war shall end. Section 8 (b) of the bill, S. 1405, makes it clear that this amendment is not intended to be disturbed.

SECTION 9

Under existing law officers below the grade of vice admiral must be retired on attaining the age of 64 years. When officers in the grades of admiral and vice admiral are released from the office for which such temporary rank of admiral and vice admiral was made, they retire, providing they have attained the age of 64 years.

Section 9 of the present bill changes the statutory retirement age from 64 to 62 years, in ranks below that of fleet admiral, but authorizes the President to defer placing any such officer, in numbers not exceeding 10, on the retired list for the length of time he deems advisable, but not to exceed the date upon which such officer attains the age of 64 years. It is intended that those officers deferred by the President for special assignment will be retired upon the completion of the special assignment for which they were deferred. It is provided that the retired pay of these officers shall be 75 percent of their highest active-duty pay and their retired rank the highest held while on active duty.

Officers now approaching the age of 62 or 63 years contemplate retirement at the age of 64. If section 9 of the bill, S. 1405, is enacted these officers will face immediate retirement without adequate warning and without time in which to make preliminary adjustments in their personal affairs. Consequently section 9 contains a proviso which will delay retirement of such officers until the first day of the sixth month following enactment of section 9.

SECTION 10

Section 10 of the present bill makes the provisions of this bill applicable to the Coast Guard.

SECTION 11 (A), (B), AND (C)

Section 11 of the present bill repeals provisions of law inconsistent with the provisions of this legislation.

Section 11 (a) of the present bill repeals section 13 of the act of June 23, 1938, which provides that should it be found in time of peace at the end of any fiscal year that the average number of vacancies in the grade of rear admiral has been less than eight, the Secretary of the Navy shall convene a board to recommend for retirement a sufficient number of rear admirals to cause the foregoing average number of vacancies. It also repeals subsection (e) of section 15 of the act of June 23, 1938, which provides for a board to be similarly convened to recommend for retirement general officers of the Marine Corps in the event that there are fewer than two vacancies in the grade of general officer of the line of the Marine Corps at the end of any fiscal year during peacetime.

Section 11 (b) of the present bill repeals section 1444 of the Revised Statutes as amended by the act of August 29, 1916 (39 Stat. 579), which provides that the age for retirement of all officers of the Navy shall be 64 years, section 2 of the act of January 28, 1929, which provides that when any officer below the rank of vice admiral, including any officer of the Dental Corps, is 64 years old, he shall be retired by the President from active service is also repealed by section 11 (b) of the present bill. Section 6 of the act of June 30, 1942 (56 Stat. 465), grants the same retirement benefits now accruing to other temporary rear admirals or major generals who may be retired by reason of physical disability. Section 6 of the act of June 30, 1942, is repealed by section 11 (b) of the present bill.

Section 11 (c) of the present bill repeals subsection 12 (e) of the act of June 23, 1938 (52 Stat. 950), which provides that an officer

of the line, after the completion of 20 years' commissioned service, upon his own application and in the discretion of the President, may be retired from active service and placed upon the retired list.

SECTION 12

Section 12 of the present bill places a time limitation on section 3 of the bill. It limits the time in which the Secretary of the the Navy may convene boards to consider officers in ranks of captain and below in the Navy and colonel and below in the Marine Corps for retirement, until June 30 of the fiscal year following that in which the present war shall be declared ended by proclamation of the President or by act or resolution of the Congress.

CONTEMPLATED CHANGES IN THE NAVY SYSTEM OF PROMOTION BY SELECTION

Many of the laws relating to the promotion by selection of officers of the Navy and Marine Corps have been suspended during the war. Upon the termination of the war these laws now in suspension will become reactivated.

The committee understands that the Navy Department is making a study of changes which seem desirable in the body of law governing promotion by selection in the Navy and the committee intends to hold hearings and possibly recommend changes in existing law prior to the time existing law becomes fully effective by reason of termination of the present war.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1580) to provide for the appointment of representatives of the United States in the organs and agencies of the United Nations, and to make other provisions with respect to the participation of the United States in such organizations was announced as next in order.

Mr. HILL. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

PROCEDURE IN CONDEMNATION OF PROPERTY FOR LOWER MISSISSIPPI RIVER FLOOD-CONTROL PROJECT

The bill (H. R. 1902) to amend section 4 of the act entitled "An act for the control of floods on the Mississippi River and its tributaries, and for other purposes," approved May 15, 1928, was announced as next in order.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let the bill go over.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am glad to do so.

Mr. OVERTON. The purpose of the bill is simply to place the flood-control provision in reference to condemnation proceedings relating to the lower Mississippi Valley in line with the usual rule which prevails throughout the rest of the United States. The rule prevailing throughout most of the United States is that whenever the Government acquires property by condemnation, the practice and procedure shall be in accordance with the provisions of the State law, insofar as it is applicable. The rule in relation to the condemnation of property in the lower Mississippi Valley is different from that obtaining in the other sections of the United States.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I see the entire purpose of the bill. I withdraw my objection.

Mr. OVERTON. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 1902) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1516) to amend section 12 of the Bonneville Project Act, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BILBO. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

EXTENSION OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA EMERGENCY RENT ACT

The bill (H. R. 3979) to extend for the period of 1 year the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TAXATION OF RAILROAD ROLLING STOCK IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (S. 1278) to provide for the taxation of rolling stock of railroad and other companies operated in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the rolling stock of railroad companies, refrigerator-car companies, parlor-car companies, sleeping-car companies, tank-car companies, express companies, car-renting companies, and all other companies owning parlor, sleeping, dining, tank, freight, or any other cars which are operated or run over or upon the line or lines of any railroad or terminal company in the District of Columbia, shall be deemed to be located in said District for purposes of taxation, whether or not the individual units are continuously in the District or are constantly changing, and such property shall be reported, assessed, and taxed within the time, and at the rates prescribed by law for the reporting and taxation of other personal property in the District of Columbia.

(b) Such rolling stock as is primarily located in the District of Columbia shall be reported and taxed at its full and true value on the last day of the calendar year preceding the tax date.

(c) Such rolling stock as is not primarily located in the District of Columbia shall be reported and taxed in the manner following:

(1) Every railroad company operating rolling stock over or upon the line or lines of any railroad or terminal company in the District shall report to the assessor of the District of Columbia the various classes of such rolling stock so operated by such company whether owned by it or any other railroad company; the number of miles traveled by each class of such rolling stock within the District during the calendar year next preceding the tax date; the total number of miles traveled by each class of such rolling stock on all lines over which such company operates during the calendar year next preceding the tax date; the total full and true value of each class of such rolling stock owned by such company on the last day of the calendar year next preceding the tax date; and such other facts and information as said assessor may require. The taxable portion of the rolling stock of each such company shall be determined by applying the mileage traveled in the District by the various classes of such rolling stock operated in the District by such company to the total mileage traveled by the various classes of such rolling stock on all lines over which such company operates, and the tax shall be assessed on that portion of such rolling stock owned by such company on the last day of the calendar year next preceding the tax date. The mileage and value of the rolling stock owned by such company which is permanently located outside of the District of Columbia shall not be included in the computation of such assessment.

(2) Every parlor-car company and sleeping-car company owning parlor and sleeping cars (except those owned by railroad companies and described in paragraph (1) of this subsection) which are operated in the District over or upon the tracks of any railroad or terminal company, shall report to the Assessor of the District of Columbia the total number of miles traveled by all such cars, and also the miles traveled by such cars within the District, during the calendar year next preceding the tax date; the total full and true value of all of such cars so used as of the last day of the calendar year next preceding the tax date; and such other facts and information as said assessor may require. The taxable portion of the value of the cars owned by any such company and used within the District shall be determined by applying to such value the ratio between the mileage traveled by such cars in the District and the total mileage traveled by such cars within and without the District.

(3) Every car company, mercantile company, corporation or individual (other than railroad, parlor-car and sleeping-car companies described in paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection) owning or leasing any stock cars, furniture cars, fruit cars, refrigerator cars, meat cars, oil cars, tank cars, or other similar cars, which are run over or upon the line or lines of any railroad or terminal company in the District of Columbia, shall furnish to the Assessor of the District of Columbia, on forms prescribed by said assessor, a true, full, and accurate statement, verified by the affidavit of the officer or person making the same, showing the aggregate number of miles made by their several cars over or upon the several lines of railroad within the District of Columbia during the calendar year next preceding the tax date; the average number of miles traveled per day within the District of Columbia by the cars covered by the statement in the ordinary course of business during the year; and such other pertinent facts and information as said assessor may require.

Every railroad company whose lines run through or into the District of Columbia shall annually furnish to the said assessor a statement showing the name and address of every car company, mercantile company, corporation, or individual (other than railroad, parlor-car, and sleeping-car companies described in paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection) whose cars made mileage over its tracks in the District of Columbia during the calendar year next preceding the tax date, and the total number of miles made within the District of Columbia by each during said period.

It shall be the duty of the said assessor to ascertain from the best and most reliable information that can be obtained and from said statements the number of cars required to make the total mileage of each such car company, mercantile company, corporation, or individual within the District of Columbia during the period aforesaid, and to ascertain and fix the valuation upon each particular class of such cars, and the number so ascertained to be required to make the total mileage within the District of Columbia of the cars of each such car company, mercantile company, corporation, or individual within said period shall be assessed against the respective car companies, mercantile companies, corporations, or individuals. The valuation thus obtained shall be the full and true value and shall be the taxable portion of the cars

owned by any such car company, mercantile company, corporation, or individual and used within the District of Columbia.

(d) All of the provisions of law relating to the filing of returns, assessment, payment, and collection of personal-property taxes in the District of Columbia shall be applicable to the companies described in the foregoing subsections.

(e) Any individual, partnership, unincorporated association, or corporation aggrieved by any assessment of taxes made pursuant to the provisions of this act may appeal therefrom to the Board of Tax Appeals for the District of Columbia in the same manner and to the same extent as set forth in sections 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12 of title IX of the act entitled "An act to amend the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, and for other purposes," approved May 16, 1938.

(f) The provisions of this act shall be applicable to the taxable year beginning July 1, 1945, and each taxable year thereafter.

RECORDING AND RELEASING OF LIENS ON CERTIFICATES OF TITLE FOR MOTOR VEHICLES, ETC.

The bill (S. 1212) to provide for the recording and releasing of liens by entries on certificates of title for motor vehicles and trailers, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 12 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the recording and releasing of liens by entries on certificates of title for motor vehicles and trailers, and for other purposes," approved July 2, 1940, is hereby amended to read:

"SEC. 12. The fee for recording liens or assignments or releases of liens upon a certificate shall not exceed the sum of 50 cents for each lien or assignment or release of lien on each automobile contained in the instrument."

VOLUNTARY APPRENTICESHIP IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (S. 1189) to provide for voluntary apprenticeship in the District of Columbia was announced as next in order.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, the bill was introduced by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. It is a very lengthy bill. It merely establishes a system by which apprentices will be recognized in the District, and provides for the appointment of an apprenticeship council. It is in line with the system which prevails in many of the States of the Union, and there has been quite a demand by industry in the District of Columbia for just such a law. It meets with the approval of the Commissioners and the attorneys.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That it is the purpose of this act to open to young people in the District of Columbia the opportunity to obtain training that will equip them for profitable employment and citizenship; to set up, as a means to this end, a program of voluntary apprenticeship under approved apprenticeship agreements providing facilities for their training and guidance in the arts and crafts of industry and trade, with parallel instruction in related and supplementary education; to promote employment opportunities for young people under conditions providing adequate training and reasonable earnings; to relate the supply of skilled workers to employment demands; to establish standards for apprentice training; to establish an Apprenticeship Council; to provide for the establishment of local joint trade apprenticeship committees to assist in effectuating the purposes of this act; to provide for a Director of Apprenticeship within the District of Columbia; to provide for reports to the Congress and to the public regarding the status of apprenticeship in the District of Columbia; to establish a procedure for the determination of apprenticeship agreement controversies; and to accomplish related ends.

SEC. 2. Without regard for any other provision of law with respect to the appointment of officers and employees of the United States or the District of Columbia, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall appoint an Apprenticeship Council, composed of three representatives each from employer and employee organizations, respectively. The Superintendent of Schools in the District of Columbia or, if he shall so designate, his representative in charge of trade and industrial education, and the Director of the District of Columbia Employment Center shall, ex officio, be members of said council, without vote. The terms of office of the members of the Apprenticeship Council first appointed by the Commissioners shall expire as designated by them at the time of making the appointment: One representative each of employers and employees being appointed for 1 year; one representative each of employers and employees being appointed for 2 years; and one representative each of employers and employees for 3 years. Thereafter, each member shall be appointed for a term of 3 years. Any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term of his predecessor shall be appointed for the remainder of said term. The compensation of each member may be fixed without regard to the provision of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and each member of the council, not otherwise compensated by public money, shall be paid not more than $10 per day for each day spent in attendance at meetings of the Apprenticeship Council.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of Labor shall appoint a Director of Apprenticeship who shall serve without compensation and who shall have no vote. Without regard for the provisions of any other law with respect to the appointment of officers and employees of the United States or the District of Columbia, the Director of Apprenticeship shall be chosen from among the employees of the Apprentice Training Service actually engaged in formulating and promoting standards of apprenticeship under the provisions of Public Law, No. 308. The Apprentice Training Service is further authorized to supply the Director or the council with such clerical, technical, and professional assistance as shall be deemed by said Service to be essential to effectuate the purposes of this act.

SEC. 4. The Apprenticeship Council shall meet at the call of the Director, or the chairman thereof, and shall aid in formulating policies for the effective administration of this act. Subject to the approval of the Secretary of Labor, the Apprenticeship Council shall establish standards for apprenticeship agreements in accordance with those prescribed by this act, shall issue such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the intent and purposes of said act, and shall perform such other functions as are necessary to carry out the intent of this act. Not less than once every 2 years the Apprenticeship Council shall make a report through the Commissioners of its activities and findings to the Congress and to the public.

SEC. 5. The Director, under the supervision of the Secretary of Labor and with the advice and guidance of the Apprenticeship Council, is authorized to administer the provisions of this act in cooperation with the Apprenticeship Council and local joint trade apprenticeship committees, to set up conditions and training standards for apprentices, which conditions or standards shall in no case be lower than those prescribed by this act; to act as secretary of the Apprenticeship Council and of joint trade apprenticeship committees; to approve, if, in his opinion, approval is for the best interest of the apprentice, any apprentice agreement which meets the standards established by or in accordance with this act; to terminate or cancel any apprenticeship agreement in accordance with the provisions of such agreement; and to perform such other duties as are necessary to carry out the intent of this act: *Provided*, That the administration and supervision of related and supplemental instruction for apprentices, coordination of the instruction with job experiences, and the selection and training of teachers and coordinators for such instruction shall be the responsibility of the District Board of Education.

SEC. 6. Local joint trade apprenticeship committees in any trade or group of trades may be approved by the Apprenticeship Council. Such apprenticeship committees shall be composed of an equal number of employer and employee representatives appointed by the groups or organizations they represent, or the committee may consist of the employer and not less than two representatives from the recognized bargaining agency. In a trade or group of trades in which there is no bona fide employee organization, the Apprenticeship Council may appoint a joint trade apprenticeship committee from persons known to represent the interests of employers and of employees, or the council may act itself as such joint committee. Subject to the review of the council, and in accordance with standards established by or under authority of this act, joint trade apprenticeship committees may set up standards to govern the training of apprentices and give such aid as may be necessary in effectuating such standards.

SEC. 7. The term "apprentice," as used herein, shall mean a person at least 16 years of age who has entered into a written agreement, hereinafter called an apprenticeship agreement, with an employer, an association of employers or an organization of employees, which apprenticeship agreement provides for not less than 4,000 hours of reasonably continuous employment for such person and for his participation in an approved program of training through employment and through education in related and supplemental subjects.

SEC. 8. Every apprenticeship agreement entered into under this act shall contain—

(1) the names and signatures of the contracting parties, including the apprentice's parent or guardian if he be a minor;

(2) the date of birth of the apprentice;

(3) a statement of the trade, craft, or business which the apprentice is to be taught and the time at which the apprenticeship will begin and end;

(4) a statement showing the number of hours to be spent by the apprentice in work and the number of hours to be spent in related and supplemental instruction, which instruction shall be not less than 144 hours per year;

(5) a statement setting forth a schedule of the processes in the trade or industry divisions in which the apprentice is to be taught and the approximate time to be spent at each process;

(6) a statement of the graduated scale of wages to be paid the apprentice and whether the required school time shall be compensated;

(7) a statement providing for a period of probation during which time the apprenticeship agreement shall be terminated by the Director, at the request in writing of either

party, and providing that after such probationary period the apprenticeship agreement may be terminated by the Director by mutual agreement of all parties thereto, or canceled by the Director for good and sufficient reasons;

(8) a provision that all controversies or differences concerning the apprenticeship agreement which cannot be adjusted by conference between the apprentice and the employer or under the terms of the apprenticeship standard shall be submitted to the Director for determination as provided for in section 9;

(9) a provision that an employer who is unable to fulfill his obligation under the apprenticeship agreement may, with the approval of the Director or under the direction of the joint trade apprenticeship committee, transfer such contract to any other employer: *Provided*, That the apprentice consents and that such other employer agrees to assume the obligations of said apprenticeship agreement;

(10) such additional terms and conditions as may be prescribed or approved by the council not inconsistent with the provisions of this act.

SEC. 9. No apprenticeship agreement shall be registered or approved by the Director under the provisions of this act unless it conforms with the standards established by or in accordance with this act and is in the best interests of the apprentice. Where a minor enters into an agreement for a period of training extending into his majority, and such agreement has been approved by the Director, then such apprenticeship agreement shall, if the parties therein so provide, have the same force and effect during the period covered by the majority of such minor as if such agreement were entered into during the majority of such minor.

SEC. 10. (a) Upon the complaint of any interested person or upon his own initiative, the Director may investigate to determine if there has been a violation of the terms of an apprenticeship agreement made under this act, and he may hold hearings, inquiries, and other proceedings necessary to such investigation and determination. The parties to such an agreement shall be given a fair and impartial hearing after reasonable notice thereof. All such hearings, investigations, and determinations shall be made under authority of reasonable rules and procedures prescribed by the Apprenticeship Council, subject to the approval of the Secretary of Labor.

(b) The determination of the Director shall be filed with the council. If no appeal therefrom is filed with the council within 10 days after the date thereof, as herein provided, such determination shall become the order of the council. Any person aggrieved by any determination or action of the Director may appeal therefrom to the council, which shall hold a hearing thereon after due notice to the interested parties. Any person aggrieved or affected by any determination or order of the council may appeal therefrom to the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia at any time within 30 days after the date of such order by service of a written notice of appeal on the Director. Upon service of said notice of appeal, said council, by its secretary, shall forthwith file with the clerk of said district court to which said appeal is taken a certified copy of the ordered appealed from, together with findings of fact on which the same is based. The person serving such notice of appeal shall, within 5 days after the service thereof, file a copy of the same, with proof of service, with the clerk of the court to which such appeal is taken; and thereupon said district court shall have jurisdiction over said appeal, and the same shall be entered upon the records of said district court and shall be tried therein de novo according to the rules relating to the trial of civil actions, so far as the same are applicable. Any person aggrieved or affected by any determination, order, or decision of the district court may appeal therefrom to the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia in the same manner as provided by law for the appeal of civil action.

SEC. 11. The provisions of this act shall apply to any person, firm, corporation, or craft in the District of Columbia which has voluntarily elected to conform with its provisions.

SEC. 12. As used or referred to in this act, the term "the Secretary of Labor" shall mean the administrator of that Department or agency of the United States Government authorized to administer the provisions of Public Law No. 308.

SEC. 13. Sections 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 20, and 21, chapter 2 of title 15 of the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia, are hereby repealed.

SEC. 14. If any provision of this act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstances, is held invalid, the remainder of the act, and the application of such provision to other persons and circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

CONTINUANCE OF TAX-EXEMPT STATUS OF CERTAIN PROPERTY IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 236) providing for the continuance of the tax-exempt status of certain property in the District of Columbia when used and occupied by any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States of America or by the American Red Cross was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

QUORUM FOR TRANSACTION OF CORPORATION BUSINESS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (H. R. 2874) to amend the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia to authorize any corporation formed under authority of subchapter 3 of chapter 18 of such code to specify in its bylaws that a less number than a majority of its trustees may constitute a quorum for the transaction of the business of the corporation, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SALE OF CERTAIN FISH IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (H. R. 3636) relating to the sale, in the District of Columbia, of certain small rockfish, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

OPENING OF ROAD ON DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TRAINING SCHOOL PROPERTY IN MARYLAND

The bill (H. R. 3873) to provide for the opening of a road within the boundaries of the District of Columbia Training School property in Anne Arundel County, Md., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FREE COPIES OF RECORDS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOR VETERANS

The bill (H. R. 3868) to provide that veterans may obtain copies of public records in the District of Columbia, without the payment of any fees, for use in presenting claims to the Veterans' Administration, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ANNUAL REPORTS BY TRUST COMPANIES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (H. R. 3867) to amend the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia with respect to the making and publishing of annual reports by trust companies was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HELEN ALTON AND EDWIN ALTON

The bill (H. R. 2512) for the relief of Helen Alton and Edwin Alton was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ALBERT E. SEVERNS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2335) for the relief of Albert E. Severns, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment on page 1, line 6, after the words "the sum of", to strike out "$3,000" and insert "$2,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

JAMES LYNCH

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2835) for the relief of James Lynch, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "the sum of", to strike out "$8,764.60" and insert "$3,764.60."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

MABEL FOWLER

The bill (S. 845) for the relief of Mabel Fowler was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 5, secs. 751–791), Carl F. Fowler, who was electrocuted on September 16, 1943, while seeking to correct failure of electric facilities at the Army air base near Mitchell, S. Dak., shall be deemed to have been a civil employee of the United States within the purview of said act, at the time of his death and compensation for death shall be payable to Mabel Fowler, if she is found to be the widow of the said Carl F. Fowler, under the conditions provided in section 10 of such act of September 7, 1916, such compensation to be computed in the manner prescribed in said act upon the basis of $175 as representing the monthly wage of the deceased at the time of his death. Any compensation for death received by said Mabel Fowler under any other workmen's compensation law shall be credited in such manner as the United States Employees' Compensation Commission may find to be just and equitable against any compensation which she may receive by reason of this act: *Provided*, That claim for compensation for death under such act shall be filed within 1 year from the approval

of this act: *Provided further,* That no benefits shall accrue prior to the approval of this act.

MRS. STUART B. RILEY

The bill (H. R. 2810) for the relief of Mrs. Stuart B. Riley was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JAMES A. BRADY

The bill (H. R. 2310) for the relief of James A. Brady was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 2543) to require weekly newspapers enjoying mailing privileges to make sworn statements with respect to their circulation was announced as next in order.

Mr. WILLIS. Let the bill go over.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if the Senator from Indiana will withhold his objection for a moment, this bill merely requires weekly newspapers enjoying mailing privileges to make sworn statements with respect to their circulation.

Mr. WILLIS. I ask that the bill be passed over without prejudice. I have had some reports from associations who oppose the legislation, and I should like to take the time to study it a little further.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 3709) to amend section 2 of the act of May 29, 1928, and section 3 of the act of March 29, 1944, affecting the compensation of postmasters was announced as next in order.

Mr. DONNELL. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

BURGLARY, FIRE, OR OTHER CASUALTY CLAIMS OF POSTMASTERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4127) to amend the act entitled "an act authorizing the Postmaster General to adjust certain claims of postmasters for loss by burglary, fire, or other unavoidable casualty," approved March 17, 1882, as amended, which had been reported from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads with an amendment, on page 3, in line 17, after the name "United States", strike out "this limitation shall not apply" and insert "the limitation shall be 2 years as."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

ADMINISTRATION OF OATHS BY POSTMASTERS IN ALASKA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 304) to amend the act authorizing postmasters in Alaska to administer oaths and affirmations, which had been reported from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads with an amendment, at the end of the bill, to insert a new paragraph, as follows:

Each certificate of oath, affirmation, or acknowledgment executed by a postmaster within the Territory of Alaska under the authority of this act shall be signed by the postmaster, with a designation of his title as such postmaster, shall have affixed thereto the cancellation stamp of the post office, and shall state the name of the post office and the date on which such oath or affirmation is administered or such acknowledgment is taken. Postmasters shall keep a memorandum of all deeds and other instruments of writing acknowledged before them and relating to the title to or transfer of property, which memorandum shall be transmitted to their successors in the office of postmaster and which shall be subject to public inspection.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

INCREASE OF PER DIEM EXPENSES AT POST OFFICES SERVING MILITARY AND NAVAL PERSONNEL

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 697) relating to clerical assistance at post offices, branches, or stations serving military and naval personnel, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads with amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments reported by the committee will be stated.

The first amendment was, on page 1, in line 10, after the word "stations", to insert "or at civilian plants devoted to war production."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, in line 3, after the word "stations", to insert "or civilian plants."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I should like to make an inquiry about the bill. I note that it carries a provision setting the per diem expenses at $4 a day, which, as I understand, is considerably in excess of the amount of subsistence expense allowed by the Subsistence Expense Act of 1926. I rise to inquire why any special consideration should be given to the employees mentioned in the bill, inasmuch as similar consideration would not be given to others who may be incurring per diem expenses in connection with Government business?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I shall read from the report submitted by the Post Office Department.

Public Law 128 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, approved July 9, 1943, authorized the Postmaster General to detail postal employees from main post offices to postal units at Army camps, posts, or stations, without changing their official station and also authorized allowances not exceeding $2.50 per day in lieu of actual expenses while so detailed.

The limitation of $2.50 per diem has been found to be extremely inadequate in a number of cases. Many of those employees, especially those at Newport News and like places, have continued on their detail at the $2.50 per diem at a real sacrifice to themselves. A determination was made by postoffice inspectors that $4 a day was the minimum upon which these men in their particular assignments could exist.

In order that the Department may have authority to make adequate allowances in those cases where employees are now making a financial sacrifice upon the $2.50 a day allowance, the enactment of H. R. 697, which would increase the maximum allowance from $2.50 to $4 per day, is recommended.

It is estimated that upon the basis of present conditions the cost of this measure will not exceed $15,500 per annum.

It has been ascertained from the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission to your committee of this report.

That is signed by the Acting Postmaster General. There is an additional letter from Mr. Walker, the former Postmaster General, to the same effect.

The bill applies only to certain cases. It simply would give the Postmaster General the right to increase the amount in cases in which such increase is necessary; that is all.

If the Senator had heard the testimony in the committee, I am sure he would be in favor of passage of the bill.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. I rise to inquire whether there are any compelling reasons for making an exception in favor of the civilian employees mentioned in the bill, without providing for a similar increase in the per diem subsistence for all other civilian employees in the United States who now are paid what is manifestly an inadequate amount. It seems to me that the whole problem should be reexamined and that an appropriate subsistence allowance should be made for all those who are compelled to be away from their homes on the business of the Government.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let me say to the Senator that would involve a tremendous expenditure of money. As it is now, as the Senator will see when he reads the letter of Postmaster General Walker which is attached to the report, the bill would apply to such employees at Richmond, Calif.; Crockett, Calif.; San Diego, Calif.; Baraboo, Wis.; Joliet, Ill.; and Camden, Ark., where the postal employees referred to are unable to get along on the present subsistence pay. It is manifest that when the Department examines the various situations, no such increased allowances should be made except in cases where the amounts presently allowed work an injustice upon the employees.

I hope the Senator will consent to the passage of the bill.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I had in mind the fact that the wording of the bill authorizes an allowance not to exceed $4 a day. I understand that gives a discretion to the Postmaster General.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

Mr. CORDON. I make the point that no standards are set up under which the Postmaster General is directed to exercise that discretion.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; the standard is that where the ceiling amount allowed, $2.50 a day, is not sufficient to pay the actual expenses of the employees who go to those places, the increase shall be allowed.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, in view of the Senator's explanation and the fact that his explanation will be controlling in case a question arises, I have no further objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

REEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS FOR FORMER MEMBERS OF WOMEN'S ARMY AUXILIARY CORPS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1560) to amend the Service Extension Act of 1941, as amended, to extend reemployment benefits to former members of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps who entered the Women's Army Corps.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, before the bill is passed, I desire to submit an amendment which is necessary in order to prevent doing an injustice to the group of women who served either in the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps or the Women's Army Corps. Therefore, I offer the following amendment:

On page 2, in line 11, delete the period and substitute therefor the following: *"Provided,* That, in the case of any such former member who has been discharged from or relieved from active duty in the Women's Army Corps prior to the effective date of this subsection, application for reemployment may be made at any time within 90 days after such effective date."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Utah.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President——

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The effect of the bill as it nows stands will be, will it not, to extend the benefits provided by it to the former members of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps, provided they went into the Women's Army Corps within 3 months after the termination of their service with the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is true.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Is there anything in the bill which would extend those privileges or benefits to the members of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps who did not continue with the service when it became federalized and when its members were required to take the Army oath and to submit themselves to the other regulations?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I think not.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I would be somewhat interested to know about that, for the reason that the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps was formed without the obligation of service as normally required in the Army or the Navy. The members of that Corps could resign from it at any time they chose to do so, and in many respects were not subject to court martial. There was a great difference between the character of discipline to which they were subjected and the discipline to which members of the subsequently formed Women's Army Corps were subjected. The members of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps were more or less their own bosses. If they wished to leave that service, they could do so. Later, many of them entered the Women's Army Corps. However, many of them elected not to go into the Federal service, in which they would be required to take the Federal oath as a member of the armed forces.

I should merely like to be certain whether the benefits referred to are to be extended to those who did not elect to enter the armed forces, in which they would be subjected to the requirement to take the oath of allegiance and be subject to the provisions relating to court martials and all the other restraints of regular military service.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The members of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps who severed their connection with that corps and left the service at that point will not be affected by the pending bill; but those who severed their connection with it and subsequently enlisted in the Women's Army Corps will receive the benefits of section 8 of the Selective Service Act.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Those reenlistments will have to have been made within a period of 90 days; is that correct?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is correct.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I have no objection.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I think the Senator need entertain no concern, because if I understand what he has referred to, every safeguard he has suggested has been accorded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 7 of the Service Extension Act of 1941, approved August 18, 1941 (55 Stat. 627), as amended (50 U. S. C. App., Supp. IV, 357), is further amended by inserting "(a)" after "SEC. 7." and by adding at the end of such section a new subsection (b) to read as follows:

"(b) Any former member of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps who, within 90 days after termination of her service in that corps, entered active military service by enlistment or appointment in the Women's Army Corps without having accepted a position, other than a temporary position, in the employ of any employer during such 90-day period, shall be entitled to all the reemployment benefits of section 8 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, with respect to a position which she left to enter service in the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps, to the same extent that a person inducted under said act is entitled to reemployment benefits with respect to a position which she left in order to perform training and service: *Provided,* That, in the case of any such former member who has been discharged from or relieved from active duty in the Women's Army Corps prior to the effective date of this subsection, application for reemployment may be made at any time within 90 days after such effective date. The provisions of section 8 (b) (A) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, shall be applicable to any such former member without regard to whether the position which she held shall have been covered into the classified civil service during the period of her military service or during the period of her service in the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps."

PAYMENT OF ACCUMULATED AND ACCRUED ANNUAL LEAVE TO CERTAIN PERSONS

The bill (S. 1489) to authorize payment for accumulated and accrued annual leave to persons whose civilian appointments were terminated pursuant to section 4 of the act of December 22, 1942 (56 Stat. 1073), was announced as next in order.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator from Utah whether the act referred to in the bill as the "act of December 22, 1942," is one which authorizes the transfer of the civilian employees mentioned in the bill from one service in the Government to another.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I do not know whether the act to which reference has been made allowed transfers in the way the Senator has suggested. The purpose of the pending bill is merely to take care of certain inequities which have arisen with reference to these civilian employees. The bill would authorize payment for earned annual leave which had accrued to female dietitians and physical-therapy aides employed as civilians by the War Department prior to March 31, 1933.

Mr. CORDON. I note that that is the explanation to be found in the report. The bill refers to dietitians and physical-therapy aides, and I am merely inquiring whether or not the transfer was effected by section 4 of the act of December 22, 1942. I assume that it was.

Mr. HILL. It is my understanding that the transfer was effected under this act of December 22, 1942, and by an omission or oversight no provision was carried in the act so as to protect the annual leave which these persons who were transferred already had to their credit. That is the purpose of the bill, merely to correct an omission in the act of December 22, 1942.

Mr. CORDON. I made the inquiry because the class of people affected is to be limited to those who were discharged pursuant to the act to which reference has been made.

Mr. HILL. Yes. Those civilian employees were transferred to the military, and under the act transferring them an omission occurred, and no provision was made to take care of their annual leave rights. The purpose of this bill is to correct that condition.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1489) to authorize payment for accumulated and accrued annual leave to persons whose civilian appointments were terminated pursuant to section 4 of the act of December 22, 1942 (56 Stat. 1073), was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, any person whose appointment as a civilian employee was terminated pursuant to section 4 of the act

of December 22, 1942 (56 Stat. 1073), shall be entitled to receive compensation, based upon her rate of pay as such civilian employee at the time of such termination of service, for the period of any accumulated and accrued annual leave to which she was entitled at the time of such termination of appointment to be computed over the period immediately following separation from civilian service, except that this act shall be deemed to authorize payment of any person for any such accumulated and accrued annual leave which was credited to her upon her subsequent employment by any department or agency of the Government.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize payment for accumulated and accrued annual leave to female dietitians and physical-therapy aides whose civilian appointments were terminated pursuant to section 4 of the act of December 22, 1942 (56 Stat. 1073)."

PAY INCREASES FOR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1415) to increase the rates of compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government, was announced as next in order.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I ask that Calendar No. 749, Senate bill 1415, go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I announced that as early next week as I can do so, it is my intention to ask the Senate to proceed to the consideration of this bill. I hope that the Members of the Senate will be present so that it may be disposed of.

Information has been very generally disseminated among many Senators, who have repeated it to me, to the effect that Federal employees have already had a 45-percent increase in their compensation. The facts are these: There was no increase in the basic compensation of the administrative Federal workers from 1929 to 1945. The Federal workers were the last Federal employees, as a group, to receive any increase. Long after farm prices, corporation employee salaries, and wages of employees in many industries, had been increased, the Federal employee received no increase. As a matter of fact, the Federal employee lagged 2 or 3 years behind all of the other great groups of employees.

It is true that soon after Pearl Harbor the Federal workers who had been working a 39-hour week were placed on a 44-hour or a 48-hour week and received straight time without any premium for overtime. That increased amount of work was virtually the only thing which saved many of them from destitution and insolvency.

Last spring Congress increased the basic compensation of these workers in the administrative branches by less than 16 percent. At the same time we gave to them the overtime premium. So for 2 or 3 months our Federal workers were in a fortunate position, but now practically all overtime has been eliminated. Only in the veterans bureaus and in some of the minor categories are employees receiving any overtime. Consequently, the Federal worker is now left with a basic increase of 15.9 percent, or less than 16 percent.

It is true that Senators who oppose this bill will say that instead of the increase being 16 percent it has been 21½ percent. That is true. The average increase in the annual compensation of the administrative worker, instead of being 16 percent, has been 21 percent. That arises from three factors. First, there were brought into the Government service during the war period a large number of important officials in all categories. That situation did not help the ordinary employee. In addition to that, during the expansion, employment agency heads were, in some cases, compelled to upgrade workers; that is, pay more to men than their grade entitled them to receive. figures which I have just given reflect that fact. In the employment agencies, that upgrading having been reversed, as it should have been, the workers are now being properly appraised with reference to their work.

In the third place, we did accelerate to a limited extent what we term "within-grade employment." We increased the waiting period in certain cases from a period of 12 to 18 months to a period of from 18 to 30 months. All those factors increased somewhat the average, but the increase in the basic compensation of the Federal worker since 1929, under Hoover, has been less than 16 percent, and not 45 percent, as certain Senators have stated to me they have been led to believe.

During the past 4 or 5 years, as the latest studies show, the cost of living has gone up 33 or 34 percent. So we now find Federal workers receiving substantially less purchasing power than they received 3 or 4 years ago. Forty percent of them are now receiving less than $2,000 a year, and the condition with reference to those who are compelled to support wives and children is so desperate that I was nauseated as I listened to the testimony with reference to some of the cases before the Civil Service Committee.

The fact with reference to the upper brackets, agreed to by nearly all outside businessmen, editorial writers and Government leaders, is that the Government is highly inefficient because it is unable to pay the necessary salaries to obtain men to conduct properly this great, complicated Government. General Bradley told us of one example which could be multiplied hundreds of times. The Government now has in its veterans' insurance departments by far the greatest and most complicated insurance business the world has ever known. Executives of private insurance companies are paid $50,000, $75,000, $100,000, and $125,000 a year, but the most General Bradley can arrange for the men under him is perhaps only $6,000 or $7,000 or $8,000 a year. Of course, he cannot obtain experienced, high-class executives for the salaries which the Government is willing to pay.

Mr. Anderson, the Secretary of Agriculture, told us of the unparalleled necessity of bringing into the Agriculture Department men whom the Government will have to pay $10,000 or $15,000 a year, who are handling billions of dollars, and by whose services the Government may, in a single act, lose millions of dollars.

So, Mr. President, I urge upon Senators to be present if possible in order to participate in the discussion of this bill next week.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, in view of some statements which have been made by the Senator from California in respect to this bill, I wish to say that there will be given to the Senate many interesting facts and bits of information if, as, and when this bill is brought up for consideration next week. The story is not one-sided. The bill is a very vital proposal and if enacted it will cost the American people, by way of taxes, approximately $2,000,000,000 extra each year. In my opinion every Senator will be vitally interested in exploring the subject.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. Did I understand the Senator to say that if this bill is passed and enacted into law it will cost the Government $2,000,000,000 extra a year?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is exactly what I said. It will be somewhere near that figure. It will be short of $2,000,000,000.

Mr. DOWNEY. It will be short by a billion six hundred million dollars.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I had not intended to go into the details of the matter because I do not think this is the proper time to do so. But the statement that the bill will cost the taxpayers nearly $2,000,000,000 was arrived at in this way: This bill applies to 1,600,000 classified civil-service employees. It is proposed to give them a 20-percent increase across the board. If the classified employees receive the increase the postal employees will be entitled to it. The railway mail clerks will be entitled to it. All civilian employees of the Government will be entitled to it. Three million six hundred thousand civilian employees of the Federal Government are just as much entitled to it as are the civil-service employees. The increase will cost the people of the United States close to $2,000,000,000 a year, before the end is reached. I assert that the bill merits serious consideration and attention of the Senate and of the House before it is enacted into law.

There are certain wage adjustments in the Federal Government which I believe to be absolutely essential. I think there are inequities which Congress must approach, solve, and correct. But when this bill is proposed for consideration next week, facts will be presented to the Senate which I believe will clearly show that no proper exploration of this field, and especially no proper exploration of the needs of the lower-paid employees in Government service, has been conducted by this committee, and that the committee's investigations were confined almost exclusively to those who appeared before the committee and advocated doubling the salaries of Senators and Representatives, doubling the salaries of the court judges, and practically doubling the salaries of the Members of the Cabinet as well as certain other high-paid officials in Government service. Practically no time was given and no substantial evidence was produced before the committee, or was permitted by the committee to be introduced, exploring the

field of the low-paid worker of the Government, who certainly needs attention if this is an economic matter. Those questions will be presented.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. The Senator referred to the committee's not permitting this information to be brought before it. Will the Senator please explain that a little further?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I shall be glad to explain it. I had not intended to go into the subject at this time and would not have done so except that the Senator from California went into it at some length. I merely wanted the Senate to know that there were two sides to the question, and I believe a presentation of the opposing views will be interesting.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL COMMISSIONED OFFICERS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

The bill (S. 1554) to provide for the appointment of additional commissioned officers in the Regular Army, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. CORDON. Over.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I hope the Senator who asked that the bill go over will allow me to make a short statement about it, because it is an important bill, and we are losing time and are apt to lose good men.

There is no doubt in the mind of anyone familiar with the needs of the Army that there is extreme necessity for an increase in the regular commissioned staff, which is apparent, and if this bill is not allowed to pass, some of the best men in the Army who are being released will not have an opportunity to join up with the service and get their commissions at this time.

The purpose of Senate bill 1554 is to increase the commissioned strength of the Regular Army to not exceeding 25,000, and to prescribe the manner in which the additional appointments, approximately 8,000 in number, are to be made.

The bill authorizes the appointment of these additional officers in the grades of second lieutenant through major, inclusive, from among persons who have performed outstanding commissioned wartime service, and provides for the determination of the rank of each appointee to be made in the following manner.

Under the bill, credit is given each person at the time of appointment with (1) his total actual Federal commissioned service in the Army of the United States from December 7, 1941, to the date of appointment; or (2) a constructive service credit equal to the time by which his age exceeds 25 years. The base age of 25 years used in computing constructive service credit is the average age at which Regular Army officers now in the service were appointed as second lieutenants. After computation of the constructive and actual service is made, the greater figure is applied, and appointment is made in a grade commensurate with the present Regular Army time in grade provisions, which are, second lieutenants up to 3 years, first lieutenants from 3 to 10 years, captains from 10 to 17 years, and majors from 17 to 23 years.

A large number of the most promising temporary officers are now returning to civil life under the present demobilization program, and unless the appointment of such persons in the Regular Army can be accomplished at an early date the opportunity to obtain their services will be lost. The purpose of the enactment of this measure is solely to meet this situation, and the number involved is in no wise intended to relate to the size and composition of the postwar Military Establishment.

Although the ultimate peacetime commissioned strength of the Regular Army cannot now be determined because of the existence of many factors which are still unknown, it is clear that the minimum number of officers that will be required will exceed 25,000. Experience of the past 20 years has demonstrated that a minimum of 25,000 officers is required for an enlisted strength of 250,000 to 300,000 men. The officers appointed under this bill would be in grades determined by their age and experience. The bill is designed to avoid the creation of a "hump" in the promotion list such as that resulting after World War I, and to provide a method of integration of officers into the present Officer Corps of the Regular Army in a manner which would be fair both to the Regular Army officer and to the new appointee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objections being heard, Senate bill 1554 will be passed over. The clerk will state the next bill on the calendar.

HEALTH PROGRAMS FOR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

The bill (H. R. 2716) to provide for health programs for Government employees was announced as next in order.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, did order of business 750, Senate bill 1554, go over?

Mr. HILL. Did the Senator from Oregon ask that it go over?

Mr. CORDON. Yes. I had no thought that it would go over with prejudice, but I desire opportunity more carefully to examine it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to consideration of House bill 2716?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Civil Service with an amendment, on page 2, line 3, after the name "Public Health Service", to insert "shall be established only in localities where there are a sufficient number of Federal employees to warrant the provision of such services."

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Civil Service I desire to ask consent to have a perfecting amendment adopted, as follows: To insert at the end of line 17, page 2, the words *"Provided,* That whenever the professional services of physicians are authorized to be utilized under this act the definition of a physician contained in the act of September 7, 1916, shall be applicable." The distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] reported the bill, and I understand he has no objection to the proposed amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

Mr. BILBO. I object to order of business 751, House bill 2716.

Mr. CORDON. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CORDON. Was request made that order of business 751, House bill 2716, go over?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair did not so understand. Suggestion was made by the Senator from California that he desired to offer an amendment. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of line 17, after the word "environment", it is proposed to insert the following proviso: *"Provided,* That whenever the professional services of physicians are authorized to be used under this act"——

Mr. BILBO. A parliamentary inquiry. I have requested that this bill go over. Can the Senate proceed with the bill after that request is made?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair desires to have the amendment stated.

Mr. BILBO. It is all right to perfect it.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, what bill is before the Senate at the moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Calendar No. 751, House bill 2716. The Senator from California suggested an amendment, which the Chair directed the clerk to state to the Senate. If any Senator cares to object to the consideration of the bill after that is stated, he may do so.

Mr. BILBO. Very well.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, at the end of line 17, after the word "environment", it is proposed to insert the following proviso: *"Provided,* That whenever the professional services of physicians are authorized to be utilized under this act, the definition of a physician contained in the act of September 7, 1916, shall be applicable."

Mr. BILBO. Over.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Will the amendment go over with the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, if Senators who have objection will withhold the objection for a while, I should like to make a brief explanation of the bill. I am very sure that if they were familiar with the terms of the bill they would not object.

Mr. BILBO. I am afraid the Senator will convince me. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On objection, the bill will be passed over.

RECOMPUTATION OF ANNUITIES FOR RETIRED ANNUITANTS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 896) to amend the act entitled "An act to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act approved May 29,

1930, as amended, approved January 24, 1942, and for other purposes," which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 10 of the act entitled "An act to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended," approved January 24, 1942 (Public Law No. 411, 77th Cong.), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 10. In the case of those who before the enactment of this act shall have been retired on annuity under the provisions of the act of May 22, 1920, as amended, or the act of May 29, 1930, as amended, the annuity shall be recomputed and paid in accordance with the provisions of section 4 of this act."

SEC. 2. Nothing herein contained shall be construed so as to reduce the annuity of any annuitant, nor shall any increase in annuity accrue under this act prior to its enactment.

SEC. 3. This act shall become effective on the first day of the second calendar month following the month in which this act is enacted.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to offer an amendment to the bill on page 2, line 7, to strike out the words "prior to its enactment" and in lieu thereof to insert "to any annuitant for any period prior to the effective date of this act."

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I understand the amendment changes the bill so that any payments will not be retroactive.

Mr. MORSE. It makes perfectly clear that there will be no retroactive payments beyond the effective date of the act.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I may say that the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon has been studied, and I believe it accomplishes exactly the purpose he has just stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 2938) to amend the Code of Law of the District of Columbia, with respect to abandonment of condemnation proceedings, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BILBO. I ask that the bill be passed over. I should like to say that I reported the bill from the District Committee, but there have been some developments with respect to the effect of the amendment which was offered in committee to the House bill. So I ask that the bill go over until we can make a further study.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

REPORT BY SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR UPON MINERALS SITUATION OF THE UNITED STATES

The concurrent resolution (S. Con Res. 22) calling upon the Secretary of the Interior for a report upon the minerals situation of the United States was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby requested to report to the Congress within 6 months upon the minerals situation of the United States, including estimates on the current reserves of the principal minerals, and to prepare and submit within the same time such other data as he may deem useful to the Congress in formulating a program for the making of the surveys, examinations, studies, and investigations required to safeguard the Nation's future security and economy by supplying the basic geological, technological, and economic information needed to assist industry and Government in a continuing program of exploration, conservation, and development of the Nation's mineral resources.

The preamble was agreed to.

PAYMENTS OF REWARDS TO POSTAL EMPLOYEES FOR INVENTIONS

The bill (H. R. 744) authorizing payments of rewards to postal employees for inventions, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EFFECTUATION OF PURPOSES OF SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1944 IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (S. 1152) to effectuate the purposes of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "District of Columbia Servicemen's Readjustment Enabling Act of 1945."

SEC. 2. (a) The disability of minority of a resident of the District of Columbia who is eligible for guaranty of a loan pursuant to the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (58 Stat. L. 284) and of a minor spouse of any such resident (when acting jointly with such resident) is hereby removed with respect to the incurring of any obligation all or part of which is guaranteed under the provisions of said act or in conjunction with which a secondary loan is so guaranteed, and with respect to the exercise of the rights of ownership in any property acquired with the proceeds of any such obligation, including the right to sell, convey, lease, encumber, improve, or maintain the same and to further obligate himself incident to his exercise of such rights.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any building association or building and loan association or any savings and loan association, incorporated or unincorporated, organized and operating under the laws of the District of Columbia, or any Federal savings and loan association whose main office is in the District of Columbia, may invest its funds in: (1) Property-improvement loans insured or insurable under title I of the National Housing Act; (2) loans to veterans of World War II when guaranteed in whole or in part by a loan guaranty certificate issued under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 including, without limitation, such loans as are unsecured and such loans as are junior to another mortgage or lien upon the security; and (3) other secured or unsecured loan for property alteration, repair, or improvement or for home equipment: *Provided*, That no such unsecured loan not insured or guaranteed by a Federal agency shall be made in excess of $2,000: *Provided further*, That the total amount loaned or invested and held in unsecured loans not insured or guaranteed by a Federal agency as provided for under this subsection at any one time shall not exceed 15 percent of the association's assets.

SEC. 3. Any building association, building and loan association, or savings and loan association organized and operating under the laws of the District of Columbia, is authorized to lend money to veterans of World War II and others upon the security of a first deed of trust or first mortgage upon real estate, to be repaid in monthly or quarterly payments to be applied first to interest and the balance to principal until the indebtedness is paid in full, and without subscription to, or ownership of any shares, and such loans shall be known as direct-reduction loans. Direct-reduction-loan borrowers, and all persons assuming or obligated under direct-reduction loans made or held by such association shall be members of the association, and at all meetings of the members of the association, each borrower or each obligor upon a direct-reduction loan shall be entitled to one vote as such member.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1289) to amend section 1 of the Federal Power Act with respect to the terms of office of members of the Federal Power Commission, was announced as next in order.

Mr. YOUNG. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 7) to improve the administration of justice by prescribing fair administrative procedure, was announced as next in order.

Mr. DONNELL. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I think it would be improper for the Senate to take up this bill at a time when the Senate is considering bills on the consent calendar under the 5-minute rule. The bill is one of the most important to come before the Senate for some time, and I hope in the reasonably near future to have the matter brought before the Senate at a time when the Senate can give it proper consideration.

EXCLUSION OF LANDS IN DESCHUTES COUNTY, OREG., FROM CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF LAW

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 608), to exclude certain lands in Deschutes County, Oreg., from the provisions of Revised Statutes 2319 to 2337, inclusive, relating to the promotion of the development of the mining resources of the United States, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, with an amendment, at the end of the bill to add the following proviso: "*Provided*, That nothing in this act shall disturb any vested rights of any person or persons in or to said real property or any part thereof."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

ASSESSMENT WORK ON MINING CLAIMS—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1483) to amend the act entitled "An act providing for suspension of annual assesment work on mining claims held by location in the United States including the Territory of Alaska", approved May 3, 1943, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over. Similar bills have been before the Congress almost continuously during the past 13 years. They

have been passed at various times for certain lengths of time, by reason of the depression in the first instance, because of the war in the second instance, and for other reasons. But the time is approaching, Mr. President, when the public domain of the United States should not be held under mining claims without a compliance with the spirit and intendment of the law applicable to mining claims. The law is that where a claim is taken for mineral in place or for a placer claim, work should be done annually on the claim so as to develop the true worth of the claim. Suspension bills have been passed by reason of the fact that labor was scarce in some instances, and due to lack of money because of the depression in other instances. But the time is fast approaching when labor will be plentiful and when we will be looking for postwar projects to give employment. The only reason I want the bill to go over at this time is so it may be limited as to the extent of time within which it will be operative.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to suggest to the Senator that the bill is definitely limited. As the law now stands there is a suspension of the law until the 1st of July following the end of the war, as proclaimed by the President or by Congress. The difficulty with the present situation is that if a proclamation were made on June 15 or June 25 of this year there would not possibly be time to organize the necessary work to comply with the statute. So that the pending bill merely changes the existing law so that the work will be suspended until one year from the 1st day of July after the cessation of hostilities as proclaimed by the President or by concurrent resolution of Congress.

Mr. McCARRAN. I know the scope of the bill. I know that President Roosevelt, when he signed the last extension bill, said it would be the last time extension of time would be given. I think it is time to stop the whole procedure. We have men out of employment now and we will have more of them as they come back from the war without employment and seeking employment. Their source of employment in years past has been, in many instances, doing the anual assessment work on mining claims. What is going on now is that great areas of the public domain are being held in absentee landlordship by those who have done nothing whatever to develop their claims or to develop the mineral resources of the country in which the claims are located.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On objection, the bill will be passed over.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1610) to provide for the rehabilitation of the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. This is a bill of great importance. It ought not to be passed on the Consent Calendar. I ask that it go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

REGINALD MITCHELL

The bill (S. 1371) for the relief of Reginald Mitchell was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Reginald Mitchell, of North Hollywood, Calif., the sum of $106.85, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for property damage sustained by him, as a result of an accident which occurred when a United States Army vehicle collided with another automobile and pushed it into the rear of the automobile which he was driving, at the intersection of East Seventh Street and Maple Street, in Los Angeles, Calif., on November 10, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

CLEO E. BAKER

The bill (H. R. 2191) for the relief of Cleo E. Baker was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

O. M. MINATREE

The bill (H. R. 1358) for the relief of O. M. Minatree was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. ADDIE S. LEWIS

The bill (H. R. 3135) for the relief of Mrs. Addie S. Lewis was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARY GALIPEAU

The bill (H. R. 2290) for the relief of Mary Galipeau was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

L. WILMOTH HODGES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 874) for the relief of L. Wilmoth Hodges, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$9,641.75" and insert "$7,141.75."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

CLIFFORD E. CRAIG

The bill (H. R. 2189) for the relief of Clifford E. Craig was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN AUGUST JOHNSON

The bill (H. R. 977) for the relief of John August Johnson was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. RUTH COX

The bill (H. R. 2427) for the relief of Mrs. Ruth Cox was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CLAIM OF EASTERN CONTRACTING CO.—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 2518) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of Eastern Contracting Co., a corporation, against the United States, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, House bill 2518, Calendar No. 771, appears to be a bill which seeks to confer jurisdiction on one of the courts of the land. The jurisdiction of bills of this nature has always been, so far as I can recall, in the Committee on the Judiciary. For some reason or other this bill seems to have gone to another committee, although it is a matter which deals exclusively with the jurisdiction of courts. I do not think the matter should have gone to the Claims Committee in the first instance. There is no report here from the Claims Committee at this time, and I now move that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the Committee on Claims has been considering similar bills for the past 8 or 10 years to my own knowledge, and I see no reason at all why the bill should be transferred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. McCARRAN. It is not a matter which pertains to a claim. It is entirely a matter which pertains to the jurisdiction of a court.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian that the bill was properly referred to the Committee on Claims because the bill would grant the Court of Claims the right to hear a case involving a certain claim.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is a matter which has been handled by the Committee on the Judiciary right straight along. I desire to draw the attention of the Senate to the language of the bill:

That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the Court of Claims of the United States, notwithstanding any prior determination—

And so forth. In other words, this is the conferring of jurisdiction of a specific matter to a specific court. It is a matter which belongs to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada insist upon his motion to refer the bill to the Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. McCARRAN. No. I ask that the bill go over at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

ESTATE OF THOMAS McGARROLL

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3390) for the relief of the estate of Thomas McGarroll, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$5,926.50" and insert "$5,571.50."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

CARL LEWIS

The bill (H. R. 1142) for the relief of Carl Lewis was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ESTATE OF JOHN R. BLACKMORE AND LOUISE D. BLACKMORE

The bill (H. R. 2300) for the relief of the estate of John R. Blackmore and Louise D. Blackmore was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WESLEY J. STEWART

The bill (H. R. 2029) for the relief of Wesley J. Stewart was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PATRICK A. KELLY

The bill (H. R. 2595) for the relief of Patrick A. Kelly was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ESTATE OF ALFRED LEWIS COSSON, DECEASED, AND OTHERS

The bill (H. R. 1960) for the relief of the estate of Alfred Lewis Cosson, deceased, and others, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ESTATE OF HARPER THEODORE DUKE, JR.

The bill (H. R. 2886) for the relief of the estate of Harper Theodore Duke, Jr., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ESTATE OF MATTIE LEE BROWN, DECEASED

The bill (H. R. 1316) for the relief of the estate of Mattie Lee Brown, deceased, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TRAVEL PAY AND OTHER ALLOWANCES TO CERTAIN SOLDIERS OF THE WAR WITH SPAIN, AND SO FORTH

The bill (H. R. 1192) granting travel pay and other allowances to certain soldiers of the war with Spain and the Philippine Insurrection, who were discharged in the Philippine Islands, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JAY H. McCLEARY

The bill (H. R. 1978) for the relief of Jay H. McCleary was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FRANCIS A. HANLEY

The bill (H. R. 843) for the relief of Francis A. Hanley was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SYBIL GEORGETTE TOWNSEND

The bill (H. R. 850) for the relief of Sybil Georgette Townsend was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ROLLA DUNCAN

The bill (H. R. 3225) for the relief of Rolla Duncan was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN HAMES

The bill (H. R. 3011) for the relief of John Hames was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ANGELO GIANQUITTI AND GEORGE GIANQUITTI

The bill (H. R. 2836) for the relief of Angelo Gianquitti and George Gianquitti was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DR. J. D. WHITESIDE AND ST. LUKE'S HOSPITAL

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2930) for the relief of Dr. J. D. Whiteside and St. Luke's Hospital which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with amendments, on page 1, line 5, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$3,259" and insert "$1,888"; and in line 7, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$7,828.66" and insert "$4,596.16."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That concludes the bills on the calendar.

FINANCIAL CONTROL OF GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, when the House bill 3660, Calendar No. 698, to provide for financial control of Government corporations, was reached on the calendar I asked that the bill go over. Since asking that the bill go over I have consulted with the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], who is a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, which reported the bill. The distinguished Senator from Kentucky advises me there is no objection to the bill of which he is aware, and he knows of no reason why the bill should not be passed at this time. Therefore, Mr. President, I withdraw the objection I interposed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 3660) to provide for financial control of Government corporations was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN CLAIMS BILLS

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, there are on the desk five bills reported during the recess from the Committee on Claims. Favorable reports have been received on all five bills from the various departments involved. I ask unanimous consent that the five bills may be considered at this time.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I ask the Senator when the bills were reported.

Mr. ELLENDER. They were reported from the Committee on Claims today. They were supposed to have been reported during the recess of the Senate.

Mr. WHITE. Are they all claims bills?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; they are all claim bills.

Mr. WHITE. Do they come with a unanimous report from the Committee on Claims?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. As I understand, these are all bills for the settlement of private claims of individual citizens.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Louisiana? The Chair hears none.

CHARLES R. HOOPER

The bill (S. 1480) for the relief of Charles R. Hooper was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Charles R. Hooper, of Washington, D. C., the sum of $6,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained by Charles R. Hooper while employed in the United States navy yard at Washington, D. C., in the year 1894: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

MILDRED E. WALDRON

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 976) for the relief of Mildred E. Waldron, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with amendments, on page 1, line 5, after the word "of", to strike out "$10,000" and insert "$5,000"; in line 6, after the word "to", to strike out "Mildred E. Waldron" and insert "the estate of Howard Francis Waldron"; in line 7, after the word "of", to strike out "her claim" and insert "all claims"; and in line 8, after the word "of", to strike out "her husband" and insert "the said", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $5,000, to the estate of Howard Francis Waldron, of Minneapolis, Minn., in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for compensation for the death, on April 25, 1944, of the said Howard Francis Waldron, who was killed by the right rear wheel of a United States Government truck which began to move as he was boarding it near Cathedral Bluffs, Alaska: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful,

any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of the estate of Howard Francis Waldron."

HAROLD E. BULLOCK

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 905) for the relief of Harold E. Bullock, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with amendments, on page 1, line 7, after the word "compensation", to strike out "for personal injury sustained by him and"; and in line 10, after the word "which", to strike out "they were" and insert "she was", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Harold E. Bullock, of Las Vegas, Nev., the sum of $5,000, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation and for the death of his wife, Mrs. Harold E. Bullock, as a result of personal injuries sustained by her, when the automobile in which she was riding was struck by a United States Army vehicle on Highway No. 66, near Oro Grande, Calif., on July 27, 1943: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MR. AND MRS. ALLAN F. WALKER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1294) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Allan F. Walker, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the word "of", where it occurs the first time, to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$2,500," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mr. and Mrs. Allan F. Walker, of Sepulveda, Calif., the sum of $2,500, in full satisfaction of their claims against the United States for compensation for the death of their son, Dennis Allan Walker, who died as a result of burns received by him when a United States Army airplane crashed at 9363 Burnet Avenue, in Sepulveda, Calif., on January 25, 1945: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WAYNE EDWARD WILSON

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1338) for the relief of Wayne Edward Wilson, a minor, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, to strike out "$10,000" and insert "$3,000", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the legal guardian of Wayne Edward Wilson, a minor, of Lebanon, Del., the sum of $3,000 in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by the said Wayne Edward Wilson, on August 28, 1944, and for reimbursement of medical, hospital, and other expenses incurred by him, as a result of his being burned when he came into contact with a cable hanging from a live electric wire, near Lebanon, Del., such cable having been dropped onto the electric wire from a United States Army airplane: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Wayne Edward Wilson, a minor."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the last bill included in the request of the Senator from Louisiana.

REFERENCE MANUAL OF GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I should like to say a word of appreciation to the acting majority leader for the reconsideration of House bill 3660.

In that connection, in July last, at the close of the session before the recess, the distinguished majority leader asked that a certain report prepared by the Comptroller General listing all Government corporations be made a Senate Document. It was so ordered. The document has been printed as Senate Document 86. I wish to make that statement for the benefit of Senators, because I know that they will all wish to refer to Senate document 86. I hope they will obtain copies and refer to it in connection with the bill to which I have referred.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HAYDEN in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

General of the Army Dwight David Eisenhower, Army of the United States, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States as the Chief of Staff with the rank of General of the Army, for a period of 4 years from November 19, 1945, vice General of the Army George Catlett Marshall, the Chief of Staff.

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Fleet Admiral Chester W. Nimitz to be Chief of Naval Operations in the Department of the Navy, for a term of 2 years.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of William McChesney Martin, Jr. to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Herbert E. Gaston to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed this day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

That completes the Executive Calendar.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. HILL. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 29 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, November 26, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate November 23 (legislative day of October 29), 1945:

THE JUDICIARY

JUDGE, UNITED STATES CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS

Hon. Shackelford Miller, Jr., of Kentucky, to be judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, vice Hon. Elwood Hamilton, deceased.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

James E. Mulcahy, of New York, to be United States marshal for the southern district of New York. (Mr. Mulcahy is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired July 3, 1945.)

Russell Nichols, of West Virginia, to be United States marshal for the northern district of West Virginia, vice Albert M. Rowe, term expired.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Charles A. Donnelly, of New Orleans, La., to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Louisiana in place of Joachim O. Fernandez, resigned.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

George T. Cromwell, of Annapolis, Md., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 13, with headquarters at Baltimore, Md., in place of Gilbert A. Dailey.

COMPTROLLER OF CUSTOMS

Arthur A. Quinn, of New Jersey, to be comptroller of customs for customs collection district No. 10, with headquarters at New York, N. Y. (Reappointment.)

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate November 23 (legislative day of October 29), 1945:

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON, D. C.

TO BE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS FOR TERMS EXPIRING JUNE 30, 1950

William McChesney Martin, Jr.
Herbert E. Gaston.

POSTMASTERS

ILLINOIS

Louis Mini, Dalzell.
Sylvia A. Bash, De Soto.
Laurence A. Clark, Poplar Grove.
Eschol A. Houtchens, Raritan.
Ruby Maxwell, Table Grove.

KENTUCKY

Ida Sanders, Dorton.
Bessie De P. Givens, Dunmor.
Conda L. Gurley, Insull.

LOUISIANA

Claude C. Badeaux, Garden City.
William M. Jones, Heflin.

UTAH

Arthur H. Reeve, Hinckley.
Frederick C. Hoyt, Orderville.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate November 23 (legislative day of October 29), 1945:

POSTMASTER

Robert E. Lynch to be postmaster at Green Bay, in the State of Wisconsin.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 23, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Thou who doth stoop from Thy throne when the storm is high and the world is in the maze of maddening things, we would be still and know that Thou art God. Above all differences of opinion, in partisan situations, O bring us all to the common sanctuary where a common need binds all in a common fraternity. Grant that we may serve Thee in our own generation, working in such a spirit of unity and concord that the nations of the world may find our example worthy of emulation. Persuade us, O God, that the only security that lives is that which is couched in sacrifice and that rules in the spirit of the brotherhood of man.

The Lord our God hath brought us into a good land, a land of brooks of water that spring out of valleys and hills; a land wherein we shall eat bread without scarceness; we shall not lack anything in it. Let us beware that we forget not the Lord our God, for it is He that giveth us power to get wealth, that He may establish His covenant forever. In the name of the Promised One, Thy Son. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SPARKMAN (at the request of Mr. MANASCO) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor.

Mr. MAY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement he made before the Board of Review of the War Department in reference to the improvement of the Big Sandy River in Kentucky.

Mr. ROMULO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech by the Honorable Abe Fortas, Under Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix in two places, in one to include a copy of a letter and in the other an editorial.

THE SLAUGHTER OF LAYING HENS

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, the plan of the Department of Agriculture to the effect that they propose to subsidize the slaughter of laying hens is, in my opinion, worthy of very serious thought before being put into operation.

Shall we not first determine whether our people will have sufficient eggs for food before we begin to talk about slaughtering the hen? How many millions of dozens of eggs could not the starving peoples of Europe use if we happen to have more than we need? Why should we fear an overproduction of food?

Certainly it will cost us quite a lot of money to hold up the price of eggs to the producer to the 90 percent of parity guaranteed by law. That money, however, paid to the producer of eggs will come back sevenfold in gross income to our Nation, as we all know that the farm dollar changes hands seven times before it quits rolling through the paths of our economy. Remember, plenty of food, and food alone, will prevent chaos in many European nations this winter.

Mr. Speaker, it will cost our Nation much more than these few millions of dollars for price supports if we countenance any plan which has for its basic principle the lessening of production of food. It would seem to me that no nation can prosper by destroying potential food production while other nations starve.

Today the housewives in this city are paying 73 cents a dozen for eggs and it would appear to be very poor policy to advocate anything now that would make it still more difficult for the poor people of this Nation to obtain that great food. Eggs sell for 40 cents per dozen in southwestern Minnesota. It would be well to find out why they should cost 73 cents here.

If we do have a surplus of eggs or of any food, the Red Cross, UNRRA, and charitable organizations can see that these foods help relieve want in our own country or other nations. Let us remember what happened to our meat supply just the other year when we began to fear an overproduction of pork and our Government cut down the number of sows by threatening a lowering in the support price. Our butcher shops have been empty for 18 months as a result.

Mr. Speaker, it is a dangerous thing to talk about holding down our production of food. Far better too much food than starvation. A few millions of dollars for support prices are far preferable to empty shelves in the grocery store and hungry children in the streets. Yesterday I saw 3 young boys carrying home their boxes of food and groceries for Thanksgiving dinner, and they each had a dozen eggs in their box. One of them dropped his carton of eggs on the steps of the street car and was disturbed because his mother had remarked about the 70 cents needed for a dozen.

I repeat that the announced plan of the Department of Agriculture should be considered from many angles besides that of the support price. Certainly we can give to the farmer parity price for his production of all possible food today while the world is in the shape it is, with mililons of people going hungry. Permitting UNRRA to buy these surplus eggs and keep the laying hen producing is better policy now than to subsidize this slaughtering of our flocks.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a short item.

Mr. GOODWIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a resolution.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an article by Senator LA FOLLETTE, which article appears in the Progressive maga-